This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

1837
ARTES
VERITAS
SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SUAE RIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BR
1
.C54

THE

7193.7

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

'Speaking the truth in love.'

VOL. V.

BOSTON.

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

CORNER OF WASHINGTON AND SCHOOL STREETS.

LONDON, BY JOHN MILLER.

LIVERPOOL, BY EDWARD WILMER.

1828.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

MISCELLANY.

	Page
Clerical Duties	101
Cooke, Rev. Parsons, Letter to	277
'Everlasting Punishment,' and 'Life Eternal,' the meaning of the Expressions in Matt. xxv. 46.	441
Galatians, St Paul's Epistle to the	285
Howe, Hon. Samuel, Sketch of the Life and Character of	185
Lord's Supper, The Rite of, a Symbolical Language	203
Mather, Cotton and Samuel, Original Letters to	365
Orthodox and Liberal Parties, State of the Question between the	1

POETRY.

The Dying Child	13
To H—	284
Heaven	202
Recollections of a Sermon	370
'Remember now thy Creator, in the days of thy Youth	112

REVIEW.

Annual Report of the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance	209
Annual Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance	209
Apostles, Lives of the Twelve, by F. W. P. Greenwood	371

Beecher, Rev. Lyman, D. D., Letters on Infant Damnation 229, 316, 506
Bonaparte, Napoleon, Life of, by the Author of Waverley 135
Children, Original Moral Tales designed for . . 402
Churches of Christ, Vindication of the Rights of, in the Spirit of the Pilgrims 298, 478
Dick, Thomas, his Christian Philosopher 14
Haven, Nathaniel Appleton, Remains and Memoir of, by George Ticknor 70
Juvenile Miscellany 402
The Mirror; or, Eighteen Juvenile Tales and Dialogues 402
Paley, William, D. D., Sermons originally published in 1825 113
Palfrey, Rev. John G., Discourses on Intemperance. 209
Parr, Rev. Samuel, LL. D., Memoirs of, by the Rev. W. Field and John Johnstone, M. D. . . . 154, 453
Story, Joseph, Discourse before the Essex Historical Society 391
Stuart, Moses, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews 37

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Cameron, Rev. John, Scripture Doctrine concerning God and Christ 421
Campbell, David, on the Duty and Privilege of Spreading the Gospel 89
Cardozo, Isaac N., Discourse before the Reformed Society of Israelites 167
Channing, Rev. W. E., D. D., Discourse at the Installation of Rev. M. I. Motte 341
Channing, Rev. W. E., D. D., Discourse at the Ordination of the Rev. F. A. Farley 422
Christian Teacher's Manual 166
Cypress Wreath 163
Dabney, J. P., Annotations on the New Testament . 343
Damon, Rev. David, Farewell Sermon at Lunenburg . 88
Furness, Rev. William Henry, Dedication Sermon at Philadelphia 538
Gilman, Rev. Samuel, Sermon on Unitarianism, as free from Objectionable Extremes 84
Greenwood, Rev. F. W. P., Sermon on the peculiarities of Christianity 86

Greenwood, Rev. F. W. P., Sermon on the Prospects of Christianity 163
Griffin, Rev. Ed., D. D., Sermon before the Convention of Congregational Ministers 267
Hurlbut, M. L., Presumptive Arguments in favor of Unitarianism 424
Hutton, Joseph, LL. D. Sermon Preached before the Supporters of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association 540
Lamson, Rev. A., Sermon on Confidence in Christ . 85
Letter from a Gentleman of Boston to a Unitarian Clergyman of that City 89
Loveland, Samuel C., Greek Lexicon for the New Testament 265
Lowell, Rev. Charles, D. D., Sermon on the Name of Christian 87
Moral Lessons in Verse, by the Editor of the Juvenile Miscellany 167
Morgridge, Charles, Sermon at the Opening of the Christian Chapel in Salem 345
Outlines of the History of Ancient Rome, embracing its Antiquities; on the plan of the Rev. David Bair . . 542
Outlines of the History of England, on the plan of the Rev. David Blair 542
Peabody, Rev. W. B. O., Address before the Hampden Colonization Society 345
Phelps, Rev. Dudley, Sermon at Haverhill—'Faith and Works inseparable' 541
Phelps, Rev. Dudley, Thanksgiving Sermon . . 541
Pierpont, Rev. John, Sermon at the Ordination of Rev. S. Presbury—'As you sow, so must you reap' . . 264
Reply of a Unitarian Clergyman to the 'Letter of a Gentleman of Boston' 89
Review of a 'Letter of a Gentleman of Boston to a Unitarian Clergyman of that city' 89
Revivals, Letters on 88
Sabine, Rev. James, Dedication Sermon—'The Glory of the Latter House' 162
Scott, Sir Walter, Religious Discourses 346
Sullivan, Rev. T. R., Dedication Sermon at Walpole, N. H. on the Nature and Remedy of Sin 165
Thayer, Rev. Nathaniel D. D., Sermon at Townsend . 88

The School, or Lessons in Morals 266
Thrush, Capt. Thomas, Letters on War 265
Todd's Johnson's and Walker's Dictionaries combined . 85
Trust Deeds, considered in a Pamphlet, entitled 'The Recent Attempt,' &c. 89
Turner, W., Abstract of Bible History 166
Universalists, the Right of, to testify in a Court of Justice 87
Unitarian Clergyman, Letter to, by a Gentleman of Boston 89
Walker, Rev. James, Sermon on the Exclusive System 84
Ware, Rev. Henry, Jr, Address before the York County Unitarian Association 88
Warton, Rev. John, D. D., Deathbed Scenes and Pastoral Conversations 165
Watson, Richard, D. D., Apology for the Bible . . 166
Which Society shall you join, Liberal or Orthodox 264
White, Rev. John, Sermon on Christian Liberty . 89
Whitman, Rev. Bernard, Discourse on Regeneration . 89

INTELLIGENCE.

Adam, Rev. William, Letter from 176
" " " Aspersion upon, unfounded . 177
American Journal of Education 95
American Unitarian Association 269
" " " Correspondence of 90, 347, 429
British and Foreign Unitarian Association, Letter from, 91
Account of Third Anniversary 437
Clowes, John, Letter on the Suppression of Intemperance 172
Ireland, Protestantism in 178
Kenrick's Exposition 95
Little's Sermons 95
Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers 272
Orthodox Policy 94
Progress of Liberal Opinions in Worcester County 91
Philadelphia, New Church in 179
Rammohun Roy, Works of, ... 94
" " Extract of a Letter from, . . . 94
" " Aspersion on, unfounded . . 177
Singular Revival in Kehukee Co. North Carolina . . 92
Suppression of Intemperance 172

Test and Corporation Acts 177
Theological School in Cambridge 353
Turner, William 171
Unitarian Advocate 95
Unitarian Library 177
Unitarian Ministers, Want of, and Means of Supplying 352
Unitarian Mission at Calcutta 175, 267, 542
" " in Bengal 353, 425
Unitarian Tracts, New Series of 177
Unitarianism, State of, in Bengal 353, 425
" " Bristol County . . 348, 351
" " Calcutta . . 175, 267, 437
" " Essex County, (S. E. part) 350
" " Franklin County . 347, 430
" " Geneva 168
" " Georgia 90
" " Hampden County . . 429
" " Hampshire County . . 352
" " Maine, Cumberland County 432
" " Marietta, Ohio 90
" " Massachusetts, Worcester County . . . 91, 351
" " Middlesex County . . 431
" " New Hampshire . . . 433
" " Ohio 434
" " Penobscot County, Me. . . 433
" " Pennsylvania . . 92, 434
" " Philadelphia 169
" " Plymouth County . 351, 432
" " York County, Me. . . . 432
" " Vermont 434

DEDICATIONS.

Athol 542
Belgrade, Me 438
Boston 95
Natick 543
Newton 95
Quincy 542
Raynham 438

INSTALLATIONS.

Boston 272
Charlton 361
Salisbury and Amesbury 361

ORDINATIONS.

Baltimore 272
Brighton 273
Cambridge 179
Dennis 273
East Bridgewater 543
Hardwick 438
Hubbardston 543
Littleton 95
New York 273
Northfield 95
Providence 438

View of Public Affairs . . . 96, 180, 273, 361

OBITUARIES.

Henry Hill, Esq. 363
John Mellen, Esq. 439
Rev. George Otis 182
Mrs Rebecca Phillips 184
Mrs Jane Robinson 276
Mrs Grace Webster 100
Mrs Louisa Greele 543
Miss Eliza Ann Delano 544

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—NO. I.

JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

ON THE STATE OF THE QUESTION BETWEEN THE ORTHODOX AND LIBERAL PARTIES IN THIS COUNTRY.

THERE is nothing more worthy of notice, than the unquestionable fact, that while the Calvinistic body of this country is making the most violent assaults on Liberal opinions, they are silently, but surely advancing towards the very opinions they so eagerly condemn. One would think that some secret consciousness of this sort, lent fervor and agitation to their zeal, and prompted them as far as possible to magnify the points of difference. We certainly are not of those who think lightly of this difference. Yet, in giving a slight review, in the commencing number of the year, of the state of the question between the parties, we shall advert to the points of agreement as well as to those of difference. We do not propose in this article to review that progress of opinion to which we have adverted,—for that would exceed the limits we have assigned to ourselves—but to give our readers simply and in few words the present state of the case.

Let us further observe that while using the terms *Orthodox* and *Liberal*, we do not make ourselves responsible for the intrinsic propriety of either of them. If *Orthodox* means correct and right, we cannot, of course, concede the advantage of this title to our opponents. If *Liberal* means enlightened and generous in sentiment, it were arrogant to appropriate this title to ourselves.

We consider both of these words, therefore, as mere appellations that are in current use to designate two great religious parties in this country.

No one can pass through the country even on a journey, without hearing the belief of these two classes constantly discussed. And the question is continually asked, Wherein do they differ? It is a question, therefore, we may suppose, on which information is wanted. But the amount of the difference, also, is a subject of continual dispute. It would seem, therefore, that it is not well settled. This circumstance, then, together with the want of information, will justify us in giving it some attention. It is important, moreover, that we keep our eye on these differences—so far at least as to understand them, because, in the eagerness of controversy, there is a continual tendency on both sides to push the faith of the other to the verge of extravagance. Now as it would be an evil to the Calvinist to have more laid on him by his opponent than he is inclined to believe, so would it be an injury to the Unitarian to admit for one moment, as true, many things that are imputed to him.

The subject of these differences needs to be considered for another reason. It not only involves considerable difficulty,—the necessary discriminations, that is to say, not only involve considerable difficulty, through the insensible changes of opinion, and the liability to misrepresentation on both sides, but the manner in which the differences themselves are spoken of on our part, has been made a topic of severe reprehension. It is alleged that we keep these differences out of sight, or that we represent them as very small and immaterial, and thus equally mislead the community; and yet, on the other hand, we are accused of the inconsistency of magnifying the matters in dispute and making them greater than they are.

These charges demand some attention, and we trust we shall be borne with while we offer some remarks on the subject to which they relate. We are as reluctant to speak of anything connected with the sore and bitter irritations of these times as any one can be to read. We would to God, that good and sober men could be suffered to pursue their course more quietly. Our very souls are pained and sick of every day's story, and every body's strife. May the time come, yet we dare not pray for its speedy coming, when humble and modest men of whatever name, may go to their graves in peace.

Yet it is from the natural reluctance which many of us feel to speak of controversy, that we are charged with covering up the differences, or reducing them to matters of small account.

Let us then task ourselves to say something of these things. Let us also reply to the charge of inconsistency.

It will be seen, as we pursue the subject of these differences, that the two methods which we have of speaking about them, are perfectly consistent; that the diversity arises from the different relations in which we view the matters in dispute; that when we speak differently, we are in fact speaking of different things. When we say the disparity is small and immaterial, we mean that it is so, as far as fundamental truths are concerned; we mean that both systems admit truths enough to save the soul. The difference, therefore, in this view of it, is not, in our judgment, material. But on the other hand, we do believe that the truth is much better for a man, than what we deem to be error; that it is much better fitted to make him pious, peaceful, and happy. We cannot be indifferent about what our fellow men think of God and religion, the most momentous of all subjects, and must be allowed to have a conscientious desire for the spread and maintenance of what we believe to be the truth, as well as others, of what they believe to be the truth.

We will now proceed to state what we conceive to be the amount of the difference between us and our Trinitarian and Calvinistic brethren. The proper plan for doing this will require us also to state wherein we agree. We shall combine both these statements, while we pass in brief review several leading articles of the christian faith.

I. We both believe, then, in *one God* of infinite perfection. And with all our hearts do we join with the Trinitarian, and with every man of every creed, in saying that this God, the Sovereign and Father of the universe, is worthy of unspeakable love, of unfeigned obedience, of unlimited trust and submission, and of the most joyful and overflowing gratitude. Who shall impeach us on this point? We know, alas! that we do not love him as we ought; but we do know nevertheless that we inculcate the love of him, and that we regard this love of God as the first, highest, and most blessed of all our affections. Without this, a rational nature would lose its charm, and glory, and hope. We believe, then, in the divine perfection; we believe in infinite perfection. Do any believe more?

Yet there are differences, it scarcely needs to be said, with regard to the Supreme Being. But the declared and professed difference, let it be observed, does not relate to the moral perfection of God, but to the mode of his existence. It is not whether he is great and wise and holy and good, but whether he exists in this or that manner. We are not, of course, going now

into the argument concerning the trinity. We are firmly persuaded that the scriptures teach no such doctrine. But even if we thought that they did, and another could not see the evidence that satisfied us, we could not deem a point concerning the metaphysical and mysterious nature of God, a material or a dividing point. But here our concessions must stop. The point is not material, perhaps; but it is important. The worship of one God in three persons, to a reflecting mind, involves much that is trying and distressing. Many, with Dr Watts, have confessed this. The rash judgment may see no difficulty, but not so the thoughtful mind. For after all its attempts to use words that may escape the charge of selfcontradiction, such a mind will still find itself actually worshipping the three persons, as if they were different beings. So far therefore as the trinity, as a doctrine, is carried out into the actual thoughts, so far as it is divested of those folds of technical theology, in which it is wrapped up, it robs,—that is, in our own apprehension it robs our minds, it robs creation, it robs the bible, of the single and sublime unity of God. We do not say that Trinitarians go to this length, but we believe it is because they do not go where their creed would lead them.

But we have not yet said all we wish on this first and great article of belief. We have said that both parties believe in a God of infinite perfection. And this, in the general, is true. And yet we are compelled to say, that, in our apprehension, the prevailing theology of this country has had the effect to lower the sense of God's perfection, and to draw the hearts of men from him. In particular, the doctrine of native depravity, connected with the doctrine of eternal punishment, has had this effect. The prevailing belief is, that God has brought his creatures into the world with a nature totally depraved. It is conceded too, that with this native propensity are connected the most powerful temptations to evil. And yet he who has advanced but one step in the moral course, and has taken, as he certainly would by the supposition, the wrong step, would, according to the popular creed, justly be subjected, in consequence, to endless suffering. On that step, taken in thoughtless childhood or youth, if the subject should then die, wait the horrors and agonies of eternal death. The first moral, the first erring thought of the simple child may entail upon it all the woes and blasphemies of the damned. Now who, we ask, what father, though he were ever so bad, would be willing to be thought capable of acting on such a principle? And yet, from a large proportion of the pulpits in this country, doctrines are constantly preached ascribing to the Father of Mercy, a treatment of his creatures, which, we verily

believe, would be injurious and unjust to any parent whom the preacher addresses. We confess that we look upon this as a most serious and affecting matter. We are anxious that a set of doctrines should prevail which will not drive men from their Creator, nor *drive* them *to* him, but which will gently draw them, as men are fitted to be drawn, to infinite goodness and love.

II. We may next mention the views that are entertained of *Jesus Christ.* Both of the classes before named receive him as a Saviour. To a certain extent they have the same views of his saving power. They believe that he saves by his instructions, precepts, and warnings; by his example, and by his sufferings.

The point on which they principally differ in regard to these means, is the kind of influence which his *death* was designed to exert. The Unitarian believes that it is great; great as an example of patient suffering; great as a prelude to his resurrection, and thus a confirmation of his claims, and of our hopes of a future life; great as a pledge of God's mercy, of his readiness to forgive. The Trinitarian holds that it was the death of a being, who, in one portion of his nature, was God; that it removed an otherwise insuperable obstacle to God's forgiveness; that it was necessary in the infinite plan of God's government. Now we have no particular objection to receiving these views, only that we think they are unscriptural, and exceedingly rash and presumptuous. That is to say, we have none of that objection from personal feeling which we are supposed to have. We have no unwillingness to be just as dependent on Christ for salvation as God would have us to be. We revere his sacred mission. We reverence his miraculous power. We venerate his perfect, his transcendent character. We receive his aid, his guidance, and his promises with gladness. We are grieved by the charge, so freely brought against us, of indifference and treachery to this heavenly Master, and we must be allowed solemnly and earnestly to protest against it. We cannot indeed assign to him the same place that is done by the popular theology, but it is because we believe that no such place is assigned to him in the bible.

III. The third subject of comparison which we shall introduce is that of *a future state.* We both believe in an immortality of happiness for the good. We both believe in a fearful punishment for the wicked. On this last point, however, we speak with less confidence and strength of expression, than others, whether Universalists or Calvinists. We find a striking, and we might say, an awful ambiguity in the scriptural representations of future misery. Sometimes it is represented as continued suffering; at others, as a destruction, a perdition, a loss of the soul—in other

words, as annihilation. Now we do not conceive that we are at liberty to fix our whole attention to one of these representations, as our Calvinistic brethren do. Indeed, if any will thus limit their attention to one point, others have just as good a right to adhere exclusively to another, and the Destructionist will stand on just as certain scriptural ground, as the believer in a perpetual existence of misery. We conceive that we are bound to give heed to the whole scriptural record, and to the general import of that record, rather than to particular words in it. Indeed, if the Calvinist will stand upon the particular words *eternal*, *everlasting*, *&c.* we conceive that he stands insecurely. For the Universalist rightly answers him, that these words were, and are, often applied to things of a temporary nature. Or, if any one thinks that a whole text will furnish broader and surer ground, and quotes what he thinks is the strongest of all, that 'their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched,' even that will not support him. For if he will turn to the last chapter of Isaiah, he will find this very language applied to an event confessedly temporary. These words are obviously quoted from Isaiah, and if they had a limitation there, they cannot fairly be construed to have an unlimited meaning here.

We go then, as the only safe course, to the general sense of the New Testament. We find fearful evils denounced against the unrepenting and incorrigible. We know that the misery attendant upon unrepented sin must be bitter, in this world and in every world. But we do not undertake accurately to decide what these evils are, because we do not think that the scriptures enable us to do this. We do not know altogether what it means, but we bow with fear and trembling to the awful revelation. We do not know but the guilty soul may be annihilated. We do not know but it may suffer for ages. And we do not think it sinful to entertain a benevolent hope, that, purified at length by suffering, the sinful soul may be restored to happiness. But after all, we do not feel warranted by the scriptures to expect this, and we wait with awe the revelation of the righteous judgment of God.

We are sometimes called, by way of reproach, Universalists. We are free to say, that, in strict reason and justice, and according to our judgment, the term Calvinist would be a greater reproach. For to us it appears that the system of the Universalist leans to a far more just and filial view of the attributes of God, than that of the Calvinist. But this is not material to our present purpose. We are concerned at present only to state a fact.

Unitarians are not properly classed with Universalists. We

differ from our brethren of that class; we differ especially from the great body of modern Universalists, in believing that there is a future and fearful punishment for sin. We differ still more in our practical views of preaching the gospel. For whereas they, at least many of them, very naturally with their belief, think that universal immunity from future suffering, as it is the great and special revelation of the gospel, ought to be the continual theme of preaching—we regard the moral and spiritual principles of the New Testament as the great things to be inculcated, and we do inculcate and enforce them by all the solemn sanctions of future good and evil. It must be obvious, therefore, that although it may *serve a turn* to denominate us Universalists, it serves not the great cause of truth and justice.

IV. We shall now say something, in the fourth place, of the *terms of acceptance* with God. We believe that we are to be saved, that is, to be made happy, hereafter, by the mercy of God, through Jesus Christ, and on the sole and essential condition of our own holiness. To this general statement, we suppose the Calvinist will not object. But the subject must be carried into some detail.

In the statement just made there are three points. First, the mercy of God is the original fountain and constant spring of all our hopes. Secondly, this mercy comes through a Saviour, Jesus Christ. It is offered by him as the inspired servant and messenger of God; it is assured to us by his teachings and sufferings; it is thus in a very important sense procured by him, and to Jesus, as our Saviour, we owe the most unfeigned gratitude. We trace our hopes to him as the great instrument, but not as the original cause. The cause of all is God; the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Thirdly, this mercy of God, and this medium through which it is communicated, does not lessen, in the slightest degree, the necessity of holiness in us. Jesus is not the minister of sin, nor is God's mercy the minister of sin. In different senses, therefore, we may be said to depend on God's mercy and aid, on the mediation of Christ, and on our own virtues. We depend on God as the supreme cause of our salvation; on Jesus as the teacher and Saviour appointed by him, and on ourselves, as under God, the active and intelligent agents in this work. Such are our constant representations.

Now we are continually charged with relying upon our own merits, and with rejecting both the grace of God and the Saviour he offers. There never was a charge more false and absurd than this, and yet perhaps there is not one which is more perti-

naciously insisted on. The salvation we seek, the heaven we hope for, we feel to be 'above and out of all proportion' to any virtues we possess, though they were increased an hundred fold. To think of *meriting* the blessings of *eternity* were not impiety only—it were madness; it were folly and presumption in the extreme. On the other hand we do dissent from much of the teaching that prevails on this subject. We think that the dependence on Christ is urged with an exclusiveness that too much puts out of sight the necessity of a holy life. We do not deny that this too is urged at times. But we observe that this holy life, this obedience, is not urged so much as the condition, as the consequence of the condition. The condition is faith—faith as distinguished from obedience. Now we think this separation is very improperly and injuriously made. Faith implies, involves in it, all the duties of a holy life. We would refer those who have a value for New England divinity, to one of their own writers—to an essay of Dr Hopkins' on this subject. There, if we rightly remember our old reading, it is shown by a most laborious induction of particulars from the New Testament, that saving faith is especially and essentially the *obedient* principle; that it does not relate to Christ alone, but to God, to futurity, to duty, and that it implies a holy state of feeling and conduct in reference to all these objects. With this statement we fully agree.

We think, in fine, that this whole matter is mystically represented. Faith is set forth, so it appears to us, as some mysterious act that secures salvation, and good works and good affections as consequent upon this act. Faith is said to be the peculiar grace that unites us to Christ. But we cannot think that it any more unites us to Christ than love. Love to him, to his religion, to his Father and our Father, does most obviously and emphatically unite us to him. If faith unites us to him in some other manner, it mystically unites us; that manner is unintelligible.

The popular theology claims to itself the title of *strict*. On this great subject of the way of salvation, we regard it as too lax. It tells us that there is one act of the soul, the act of faith, which insures heaven to a man, though he should die the moment after. We say, that true saving faith implies a habit of the soul, and a holy life, neither of which are the work of a moment.

V. But we are now verging on the subject of *conversion*, which we intend to make a distinct topic. Unitarians and Trinitarians, Calvinists and Arminians, agree in teaching the doctrine of conversion. Indeed, we might ask what class of religionists in the world do not? There is so little merit in believing this

doctrine, that it results in fact from the most obvious dictates of human experience and common sense. Is there a sinful or vicious man? Who does not acknowledge that in order to be happy and to be accepted of God, he must become virtuous and good? Is a man sensual, worldly, selfindulgent? Who can teach less, than that he must be spiritually born again? It is not, therefore, about the general nature, or the absolute necessity of the change, that there can be any difference, but only in regard to the *manner*. And on this point we aver that the change cannot be sudden. The beginning of it may be sudden, but the change itself from sin to holiness, from wrong habits to right habits, of feeling and action, must take considerable time to accomplish it. The doctrine of the suddenness of conversion, we conceive, is derived from certain language of the New Testament, without a sufficient consideration of the circumstances in which that language originated. The original christian conversion involved, not a change of heart only, but a change of religion; a change from Paganism or from Judaism, to Christianity. This change, the adoption of a new worship, of course, was sudden. It took place on a given day. But the change of heart, from the very nature of the case, is a thing that cannot take place in a day.

Here again we must object to the claim of strictness in the preaching of Calvinists. It seems to us that nothing can be more lax and dangerous, than what they say on this subject. They teach that the vilest sinner on earth, may, in one moment, have a work done in him that will prepare him for heaven. This inevitably results from the system of Calvinism. It teaches that every man by nature, every unregenerate man, is totally depraved. The moment that one good affection enters his heart, he ceases to be totally depraved—he is converted—he is constituted, by the experience of that moment, a Christian, and he is, of course, an heir of heaven. Now the system that teaches us that the great work of preparing for heaven may be reduced to a moment, whatever credit it takes for other things, it seems to us should not boast of its strictness.

It is an easy thing, we know, to take credit to ourselves, and but a doubtful evidence of our deserving it. We shall therefore take no merit for what we are about to assert; and yet we feel called upon to make the assertion, that, in our apprehension, Unitarians teach a more spiritually strict and thorough religion than the more popular sects in this country;—not the most strict in regard to certain outward, and, as we think, indifferent things, but the most comprehensively and inwardly strict. The distinction is not a difficult one to make. One illustration will

suffice to show it. The Pharisees were strict. They were 'the straightest,' that is, the strictest, 'sect.' Jesus taught a simpler religion, and one that in certain innocent particulars, gave more liberty to his disciples. And on this account, too, he was called in question. Why do not thy disciples fast? And why do they pluck the ears of corn on the sabbath? Behold, said they, of our Saviour, a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, and a friend of publicans and sinners. He enjoyed the innocent freedoms of life. He mingled easily and freely with society around him, not even talking about sinners and reprobates, and saying, Stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou. This the Pharisees did, and were very proud of their distinction as the holy and religious men of the country. But who does not know that Jesus taught a far more spiritually strict and thorough religion than the Pharisees?

VI. But we must not leave this topic of *practical religion* without a more distinct notice, and it is the last to which we shall now invite attention.

We approach this topic, we will freely confess, with no ordinary feeling. We would use stronger language than we can use, if we could find that language, to express the horror we feel, at any letting down of the lofty and holy principles of piety and virtue. God forbid, that there should be any just cause for bringing this charge against us. We would warn our brethren against the remotest danger of this, as we would warn them against the coming of a pestilence. With all our hearts would we pray God, that if the world is not yet prepared for the reception of what we believe to be a purer religion, without this dreadful abuse of it, then, that this religion may retire till the world *is* prepared for it. We do not believe that this is the fact. We believe that the world *is* prepared to go forward. But still we would have, if there were occasion, we would have warning follow warning, till every faithful voice is hushed in death, that the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, should not be turned into licentiousness.

In this great and solemn judgment concerning the importance of practical and vital religion, we do not doubt that our Calvinistic brethren agree with us. They may honestly think that some of our opinions tend to indulgence and laxity, and we may as honestly think that some of their opinions tend to indulgence and laxity; but here, for the sake of heaven, let us stop. Let us not rashly break into the sanctuary of each other's motives.

And why should they so readily bring against us the charge of wishing to let down religion to the standard of worldly conve-

nience or pleasure? Why should they, how can they so freely accuse us of being men who care nothing about religion, and who wish to make others care nothing about it? It is a horrible accusation, and they ought to feel horror at their own presumption, when they dare to make it. And yet they do make this accusation, and nothing less than this. All the discourtesy and unkindness that we experience, all the hard and severe looks that they bend upon their brethren, all the horror against us that is spread through the community, all the refusal of clerical and christian intercourse, all the language of their pulpits, and presses, and prayers, and conversations, and rumors, goes upon this horrible and heaven daring presumption. It is a matter of the strongest possible feeling with them. It is not against so slight a thing as an error of the head that they are contending as they do, but against a perversion of the heart; or, it is against an error of the head as resulting from a depraved heart. The language, the undisguised language of their whole conduct, is, 'You are bad men, and you are making other men bad, and we will have nothing to do with you. Beat down this accursed thing. Come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty.' . They even dare to invoke the almighty, the universal Father, as if he were undoubtedly on their side,—on the side of their system and sect. They pray against errors as if it never entered their minds that they had any errors of their own. How strange is it that fallible, weak, erring men should pray so; that they should never pray for their own errors; that they should have made the very word, *error*, mean something that always attaches to their neighbours, and never touches themselves! Are they so much wiser than other men? Do they study more? Do they think or read more? We ask these questions, not invidiously, but in simplicity and godly sincerity. We have a right to ask them. The men who lay claim to the whole and infallible truth, ought to have some special distinction in character. Are they better and wiser men? Are they men of more pure and refined minds? Are they more calm in judgment? No, not more calm,—for they profess to make zeal one of their peculiar distinctions and great arguments. And yet, let them remember that there is not a class of religionists under heaven, Jews, Mahometans, or Hindoos, but have just as much zeal for their opinions. Yes, by every mountain and river in the world, by the streams of the Ganges, and on the mountain tops of Thibet and Tartary, we find men just as zealous for their opinions as they—and, in nine cases out of ten, with just as good reason. For what is it—what is it that emboldens, in the body of the people, all this confidence and

zeal? It is tradition; it is education; it is authority; it is influence; it is terrific warning, and fearful anathema. It is not personal and thorough and unbiassed inquiry of every man for himself; every person, who reflects or observes at all, must know that it is not.

But having said thus much, and thus earnestly, we must add a word on another topic. Among the practical virtues which all Christians profess to value, is that of charity; and, as we may seem to have violated this great christian principle, let us say something by way of explanation. About nothing do we differ more with our Calvinistic brethren than this. But let us state wherein this difference consists. Not in that we profess to be better men than they; not that we claim to have more of the spirit of love and forbearance in our hearts than they. We would never forget the liability, the peculiar liability in which we stand, to irritation and bitterness; and, while we defend ourselves, as we are called upon, with firmness, we pray God that we may ever have grace to do it with forbearance. The name of Unitarian will preserve no man from uncharitableness, and we have sometimes seen it made a cloak for the worst of bigotry.

But that which we will not claim for our character, we will claim for our creed. We maintain that charity is one of its fundamental articles. Neither do we take any extraordinary merit for this; for it seems to us the simplest dictate of reason and observation, that men, frail and fallible men, should bear with each other's honest differences of opinion. There must be such differences. They result from the nature of the mind. They exist on all other subjects, and why should they not on religion? Men's minds are no more made to be alike than their faces; and there are good countenances, though they are not all the same. And so may there be good minds, good hearts, and good lives, though they do not wear precisely the same aspect.

And the great difficulty we find, the more we become acquainted with different sects, is, that they do not know each other. 'Alas!' we have been ready to exclaim, when conversing with those who are most opposed to us, 'we do not know each other.' We do not know how many solemn anxieties, how many feelings of conscious weakness and deep humility, how many fervent prayers, how many gentle thoughts and kind wishes, how many of the ineffable joys of religion, have place in the hearts of us all. We freely accord these qualities to our brethren. We know that they have zeal for God. We know that they are anxious for the interests of piety and virtue. We would to God that they could have their eyes open to see the same in us. We

would that they could have the *comfort* of this charity. May the spirit of charity and of love unfeigned descend upon us all! May all the blessed virtues and consolations, the divine graces and glorious hopes of the gospel, live and grow and abound in us, till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto perfect men, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ! D.

THE DYING CHILD.

'T is dying! life is yielding place
To that mysterious charm,
Which spreads upon the troubled face
A fixed, unchanging calm,
That deepens as the parting breath
Is gently sinking into death.

A thoughtful beauty rests the while
Upon its snowy brow;
But those pale lips could never smile
More radiantly than now—
And sure some heavenly dreams begin
To dawn upon the soul within!

Oh! that those mildly conscious lips
Were parted to reply—
To tell how death's severe eclipse
Is passing from thine eye;
For living eye can never see
The change that death hath wrought in thee.

Perhaps thy sight is wandering far
Throughout the kindled sky,
In tracing every infant star
Amid the flames on high;—
Souls of the just, whose path is bent
Around the glorious firmament.

Perhaps thine eye is gazing down
Upon the earth below,
Rejoicing to have gained thy crown,
And hurried from its woe
To dwell beneath the throne of Him,
Before whose glory heaven is dim.

Thy life! how cold it might have been
If days had grown to years!
How dark, how deeply stained with sin,
With weariness and tears!
How happy thus to sink to rest,
So early numbered with the blest!

'T is well then that the smile should lie
  Upon thy marble cheek;
It tells to our inquiring eye
  What words could never speak—
A revelation sweetly given
Of all that man can learn of heaven.

REVIEW.

ART. I.—*The Christian Philosopher; or the Connexion of Science and Philosophy with Religion; illustrated with Engravings.* By THOMAS DICK, &c. &c. First American Edition. New York, G. & C. Carvill. 1826. 12mo. pp. 398.

WE are induced to recommend this work to the attention of the christian public, not so much on account of its peculiar merits, as from a desire that the subjects of which it treats, may not continue to be left in so neglected a state as they have generally been. We would not be understood to imply, however, that it is by any means destitute of merit. On the other hand, although certainly not a performance of the very highest order, it has strong claims upon the attention of every enlightened Christian, as containing, with some considerable scientific information, many edifying views of the connexion of science and philosophy with religion, and of the influence which the former are capable of exercising upon the latter.

The object of the writer is to illustrate, and not to prove. He wishes to present strong views of the truths of religion, as illustrated and explained by the works of God in the material creation, and not to prove those truths by arguments drawn from the same source. Having confined himself within these limits, he has shown himself adequate to his design. No Christian can read his book with attention, and not feel his piety elevated, his views of the divine power, wisdom, and goodness enlarged and strengthened, his confidence in the overruling and ever present providence of the Deity confirmed. And we would even say, that no man of science, unless decidedly prejudiced against revelation, can read it and not feel some surprise at the new and more elevating views in which it presents to him some of the most familiar facts in science,—the new relations which it discloses in

studies which have been his daily occupation, and the unwonted and sometimes sublime emotions which it gives birth to in his mind, upon the contemplation of subjects in a new light, which had been objects of consideration a thousand times before, without the production of any such effect.

The principal defects in the work of Mr Dick, so far as we have examined it, are, a want of concentration and distinctness; an arrangement of thoughts too indefinite; too great a diffusiveness of style; and occasionally an extravagance in his statements and deductions which tends very much to injure the effect of other parts. In a few instances we have noticed scientific mistakes; but upon the whole these are not common—not more so perhaps than in the work of Paley. Its merits are, the great extent of its plan and the great variety of topics which is made subservient to its purposes; the strong sentiment of devotion and religious feeling which pervades it, and generally the very correct views of the nature, attributes, and providence of God which it undertakes to illustrate. We cordially recommend it to the perusal of all who are interested either in science or religion, earnestly hoping the result may be that they become interested in both.

But while we have taken up this work, partly for the purpose of thus recommending it, we have had the further purpose of urging strongly the essential aid which may be derived to the religious character of all men, from some attention to those exhibitions of the Creator which are found in the material world. Most men, whose thoughts have been much engaged upon religion as a matter of revelation, are very prone to regard it as a subject which stands entirely by itself,—as requiring from its very nature an exclusive consideration, and as having little in common with anything else. Having had their minds originally and very strongly directed to the mysteries of the revealed dispensations of God, they forget his natural dispensations. They overlook the fact that the God of scripture is the same being with the God of nature. They do not recognise the truth that the Creator of our souls and of our bodies, of the spiritual and the material world, of mind and of matter, is the same. It is certainly a fact that an immense majority of Christians, know but little of those displays of the divine perfections which are everywhere exhibited, even on the surface of the works of nature, and which are still more strikingly manifested by the discoveries which philosophy is constantly bringing to light.

There is nothing wilful or intentional in this neglect. It arises from a sheer ignorance of the whole subject. Men in general

have no proper conception whatever of the wonders of nature. Nature is to them a volume perfectly and entirely closed. Their thoughts never wander in that direction. That there is anything wonderful, or interesting, or manifesting the glory and goodness of God in the structure of an animal or of a plant, or in the laws according to which water freezes and ice melts, or in the materials, shape, and structure of the hills and valleys, which they have been accustomed to look at, and to tread over every day of their lives—is a matter of which they scarcely think. Even among those of whom better things should be expected, particularly among preachers of the gospel, how little proper knowledge of the truths of physical science, as illustrating the being, mode of existence, attributes, and providence of the Deity, is to be found. They regard it as a subject totally foreign to their pursuits and duties. Because their profession leads them to no concern with the practical operations or details of the sciences, they take it for granted that they have nothing to do with the great truths which are the result of scientific research. Because they perceive, very clearly, that they could derive little benefit from toiling over retorts and crucibles, traversing rocks, hills, and forests, or surveying the heavens night after night with the astronomer,—they very falsely judge that they have therefore no concern with those splendid illustrations of divine power which the results of those labors so abundantly display.

We admit that the light of nature alone is most precarious and uncertain. From the study of her works we doubt if any considerable progress would ever have been made in the knowledge of the character and attributes of God, or of the nature and destiny of man. Or rather, we doubt, whether, if left to himself, man would ever have been led to any investigation at all of the world about him. But after revelation has made known to him a few elementary truths concerning the Creator of the universe, a thousand illustrations and confirmations of that revelation are immediately perceived in his works. It is true that we find in almost all tribes, however remote and insulated, some notions, more or less distinct, of a God and of a future state. And it would seem that men retained these general notions of spiritual things, with a degree of distinctness, very much in proportion as each nation is in the habit of intercourse with others. Where it happened that, in the very rude ages of the world, a tribe was cut off from all the rest of mankind—with no written records and an imperfect language, exposed to constant privations, and obliged to struggle hard with the elements for a bare existence, men would soon lose their traditionary knowledge of religion,

and become merely a higher race of animals. But if tribes, however rude, were so situated as to maintain a constant intercourse with each other, the loss of this traditionary religion would be next to impossible, on account of the number of distinct centres from which the knowledge of it would be constantly radiating. Look at the accounts given us of savage tribes in different parts of the world. On continents, and islands connected with continents, where man is constantly in habits of intercourse with man, and nation with nation, the knowledge of a God and of a future state, is always found in some form and degree. But where tribes are found separated from the rest of mankind by physical barriers—barriers which have probably cut them off for ages past from human intercourse—there, knowledge on these subjects is extremely limited, if it exists at all. Thus it is doubtful whether the inhabitants of New Holland have any proper religious belief.

We allude here to those general notions of religious truth, which we suppose to have been originally delivered to our first parents; which we believe to have been never, perhaps, entirely lost by any people; and which have formed the foundation of all the religious systems which have ever existed in the world, independently of subsequent revelations. Ultimately, then, it is revelation which throws light upon nature, and not nature upon revelation. Revelation furnishes the key, which enables us to unlock and read the book of nature; but it does not therefore follow that nature may not in its turn aid and confirm the disclosures of revelation.

But not to enter into nice inquiries with regard to the origin of any of our notions, it is sufficient to take our knowledge as it is, and determine how we can employ it to the greatest advantage in the improvement of the moral and religious state of mankind. And for our present purpose, we would remark, that, in the religious instruction of the world, and in the cultivation of a religious character in ourselves, we overlook a most important source of improvement when we neglect the truths disclosed by the physical sciences. The phenomena and operations of the natural world, as explained and illustrated by philosophy, might furnish most important means of arousing the attention of the indifferent and careless; of confirming the faith, elevating the religious character, invigorating the hope, perpetuating and renewing the piety of those who are already interested; and of communicating to all, new and sublime views of the attributes, character, and intentions of God.

The grand difficulty with regard to the majority of mankind,

is, not so much that they do not admit the truth of what religion teaches, as that they do not realize it. To a certain extent they believe. They assent to the force of evidence, or submit to that of authority. They would be shocked were it doubted for a moment that their belief is not as sufficient as it is sincere. Still their belief is not what it should be, a practical principle—a principle always present and always influencing them. There are in fact few men who can constantly bring to their minds a sense of the reality of things far distant in time, or removed in their nature from the cognizance of the senses, so as to make them constant motives of action. There are few minds which do not occasionally need refreshing and renewing; which do not require to have the truths in which they believe, brought home to their conceptions, as well as to their faith. Men are not influenced in practice by any truth which they do not, or cannot, strongly conceive at the time when it should influence them. Present interests, passions, and propensities, are realized. They operate with all their force to distract the mind. It needs a strong conception of that which we believe to have past, and of that which we believe is to come, to counteract the nearer and more direct influence of present motives. The child believes that habits of idleness and love of play, will interfere with his education and destroy his prospects in life. But he has no strong conception of it. The drunkard believes that habits of intemperance will destroy him, body and soul. But he does not realize this every time he raises the glass to his lips. Men believe that God is everywhere present, and that he knows and witnesses all their actions. Yet how few must realize or conceive this truth, as they do the presence of any human individual, or who would ever dare to sin?

It is this passive reception of truth; this nominal belief, but actual unbelief, which is the cause of the greatest part of the indifference and neglect of religion which we have reason to lament in the world. It is a natural consequence of the constitution of the human mind that it should be so; and it is so in many other things beside religion. In order to induce men to persevering efforts, they must be influenced by some present excitement, or some principle which shall be constantly operating. Hence, in all ages, it has been found necessary, in order to raise the attention of men to religion, to have recourse to other means beside simply convincing them of its truth. The reason might be satisfied, and yet the inclinations remain debased, and the will disposed to evil. Men have generally been found ready enough to believe. The difficulty has been, after they believe,

to induce them to act up to their belief. In men of sober and calm temperaments, whose reason always controls the imagination and the passions, the conviction of the understanding is enough, and the moral nature accompanies the intellectual in the changes it undergoes. But it is not so with the mass of mankind; the uneducated, the ardent in temperament and disposition, the sensual, the passionate, the ambitious. They can only be interested in religion by turning the current of their strong passions into that channel. Their imagination must be influenced, and their feelings excited. It is thus only they can be made to conceive of the reality of the things which they are taught. In these, *excitement* is the substitute for the *principle* which actuates the former. In order that they may become permanently religious, this excitement must be kept up, must be perpetuated, at least till the new modes of feeling and conduct have become habitual, and habit takes the place of both principle and excitement. Hence it will be a necessary consequence, that of those who become interested in religion in this latter method, a considerable proportion must always, from the very nature of the case, finally fall away.

But not to speak of mankind in general, we doubt whether even those who are the happiest in regard to their religious belief, and who manifest most clearly in their lives its constant influence as a principle of action; who appear to be fully possessed of a knowledge of their situation, of their relation to God, and of the obligations of religion—we doubt whether even these can boast of minds always clear and undisturbed on these momentous subjects. Are there any whose faith is always sure and steadfast? whose hope is always an anchor to the soul? whose conceptions of divine things are always clear, bright, and unclouded? There are hours, we suspect, in the life of every man, in which it seems to him as if the foundations of truth and faith were breaking up around him, and his hopes were to be confounded and defeated. These are indeed sad and gloomy hours, when all that we have believed, and all that we have hoped, seems fading away in dim and distant uncertainty. Yet he must be either a very firm and enlightened, or else a very thoughtless man, who does not sometimes experience feelings like these.

It would seem then, if we are right, that all men require some powerful and present cause of excitement or of interest, to ensure that constant, pervading sense of the existence and providence of God, and of our dependence upon him, which lies at the root of all true religious feeling; that we often need something more direct and immediate and palpable, than the feelings and

sentiments which we have derived from written knowledge, which, however sublime and glorious in itself, has been conveyed to us through the fallible medium of human languages and translations of languages. Men in all ages, and particularly those who are uncultivated and unenlightened, need something more immediate and more exciting than a bare spiritual belief; they seek a present Deity. Hence in primitive times the worship of the sun, moon, and the host of heaven, and of beasts, birds, and insects; hence the worship of heroes and images in heathen lands, and of saints and images in christian. It is from the same cause that the minds of men are engaged by the splendid and imposing ceremonies of many churches; and in many other churches, as a substitute for these, a thousand artificial modes of excitement have been resorted to. In all sects which have prevailed extensively, ceremonies, or modes of worship, or processes of some kind, have been found necessary to rouse up the indifferent mind to a sense of the importance of spiritual things. These measures are all of the same kind, have the same relation to human feelings, and are predicated upon the same principle; namely, the principle which demands some definite present source of excitement—which demands that a powerful impression shall be made upon the mind of the immediate agency of God in the actual scenes which are passing.

Nothing so exactly meets the demand of this principle as the perception which we may acquire of the agency of the Deity in the universe around us. Every step we take in the study of nature, brings to us proofs of this agency, and furnishes us with motives and sources of excitement of precisely the kind which is wanted. The man who studies the material universe with a previous conviction of those truths which revelation has taught us, finds, wherever he casts his eye, fresh and living confirmations and illustrations of all that he has before learned. The book of nature teaches not a different system of things, a different system of doctrines, a different code of belief; it is but another volume from the same great Author, who has put into our hands the book of revelation. He who enters with proper preparation into the examination of the truths which physical science unfolds, cannot avoid feeling, as he advances, that his conceptions are strengthened, his feelings of reality invigorated. He finds for every disclosure in his bible, an answering commentary in the material works of God. He sees that both are but parts of one stupendous whole; and he is forced irresistibly to the conviction that, while with his bodily organs of sense he perceives before him operations which indicate the immediate agency of

Deity as distinctly as the motions of a machine indicate the originating power of motion, the other operations of the same Great Cause, which he has known only by the spiritual sense, cannot be less true or less certain. 'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee.'

There is something peculiarly interesting to the minds of most men in the mere description of the phenomena of nature. There is something still more so in tracing these phenomena to their final causes. We are strongly impressed by every statement which illustrates the existence and operations of a designing power in the creation. Every one who has studied chemistry, natural philosophy, natural history, or physiology, must recollect to have often and often experienced a thrill of almost awful delight, when any series of phenomena, or any peculiarities of structure, in themselves curious and interesting, have been shown to have some further most important design in contributing to the well being of man, or to the general economy of the universe. They afford us those plain and palpable demonstrations of the relations of the world to its Maker, which our constitution of mind renders necessary. They are, indeed, to a mind properly regulated, almost all that a miracle could be; for they help us to fresh and clear conceptions of the Divine presence and agency; they help us to a feeling of that most essential truth, that God is now working in us and around us, in all that we see and know, and that it is the same God who has continued to converse with, and to influence mankind ever since their creation.

What a storehouse, then, of yet unworked materials in the cause of religion, does the vast domain of nature contain! When we feel, as we often do, as if the things of revelation were too far and indistinct to be realized, and as if we needed from our Maker some more frequent and continuing indications of his relation to us, we have but to turn to nature, and we find them. God has not left us without a constant and never failing witness of himself. We are living in a scene which is full, nay, which is exuberant in all the attestations to the truth which we want. Whether we look above us into the heavens, around us upon the animated and vegetable creations, or beneath our feet into the bosom of the earth, we meet them in such profusion that we become at first confounded by their number and magnificence. The hand of God has been upon every thing in heaven and upon earth. His name has been written, his image stamped upon all nature, in living characters which cannot lie. The most common events of the physical world, the operations and

phenomena of nature, which are matter of daily observation, without exciting surprise or admiration, if examined with the eye of religion and philosophy at once, disclose wonders which astonish, and exalt us to the most sublime conceptions of divine things. Lo, God is here, though we knew it not!

The course of nature, so far as it appeals to our senses and observation, without any particular examination on our part, is so uniform, and apparently plain, that it excites no emotion and affords no cause for admiration. We need some instruction, some education in philosophy, to perceive the wonder and the mystery of common things. We dare say many a schoolboy has thought Sir Isaac Newton a simpleton, for regarding the fall of an apple to the ground as a fact requiring an explanation; or Dr Black little better, for thinking there was anything remarkably curious in the freezing and boiling of water. But after the attention has once been excited, nothing is so interesting as the philosophical explanation of common things. Most plain men, we presume, think there is nothing worth their particular attention in the functions of seeing aad hearing. They see with their eyes and hear with their ears; and there is an end of it. But show such men the structure of the eye—explain to them its relation to the laws of light, its perfect adaptation to its purpose, and above all its exact resemblance to optical instruments of human construction; they will be astonished, delighted, and, if they be religious men, awed. To many men, and to most men in some states of mind, one such lesson is worth a volume of homilies, for arresting the mind, and fixing its wavering faith.

We would recommend, then, to all Christians, but more particularly to all teachers of Christianity, a more intimate acquaintance with the elements of the physical sciences, and with the phenomena to which they relate and which they explain. This knowledge does not require any deep or long continued research. It may be acquired in the intervals of severer study; the intervals devoted to the relaxation of lighter pursuits; to miscellaneous reading; to the reading perhaps of indifferent poetry, or of history which fills, without instructing, and leaves too often only a painful conviction of the depravity and misery of the greater portion of our species.

We recommend the study of nature, we recommend the love of nature. But let this love be distinguished from that which expends itself in the admiration of the beautiful forms and delightful sounds and delicious odors, which the scene around us offers for the gratification of our senses; which goes no farther than the verdant covering of the earth, the azure canopy

of heaven, the brilliant spangles of the sky, the foliage of the forest, the song of birds, the fragrance of fruits and flowers. This is the province of a certain sort of poetry, and, within due bounds, is a source of very pure, though not very elevated pleasure. But there is danger that it will run into sentimentality, that it will become only a refined sort of sensuality, and learn to content itself with the mere pleasurable perceptions of sense. It is a delight, an exercise, which passes not beyond the imagination; it plays around us, but comes not near either the head or the heart. It is sometimes found in sermons, decking out religion with its tinsel finery, but is of all trash in the pulpit the most unsubstantial and unsatisfying to the serious mind. The love and study of nature which go no further than this, are childish and puerile fancies. It is as if one were to love and study the bible as a book of entertaining stories. No, he that would read nature to his profit, must go deeper. God has garnished the casket because the jewel it contains is so precious. But we must not be content with it; the jewel is better worth seeking. The works of nature are glorious, however you look at them. But he sees not half their grandeur, their magnificence, nay, not half their beauty, who looks at them only with the eye and imagination of the poet; more than all, he knows not half their power of stirring up the higher and nobler tendencies of his spirit. It is necessary to consider them as the works of God; to consider how they are his works, and how and why he is now working with them, fully to estimate all that nature can make us feel. There is something in her works deeper and better than all our senses can inform us of. It does not reside in color, shape, and proportion, but in harmony of design, in fitness of relation, in subserviency of purpose—all for some manifest end. There is in the philosophy, far more than in the poetry of nature, something peculiarly fitted for the excitement of deep and permanent religious impressions; because it tends far more to produce a strong conception of the reality of the constantly present and almost visible agency of the Deity in her works—almost, indeed, an actual perception of his power, upholding and maintaining all this vast system of things in which we live and move.

We know that we may be met by the very common remark, that science leads to infidelity, and perhaps by the antiquated sneer, *ubi tres medici, duo athei.* It must be acknowledged that a very considerable number of eminent physical philosophers have been at least skeptics, and some of them a sort of atheists. But there is a better account of this fact than that

which attributes it to the nature of their pursuits. This is worth looking into a little. Where has infidelity gone hand in hand with science? Why, where it went hand in hand with literature, taste, the arts, the pleasures, the elegancies, even the decencies of life; in France, where, so to speak, infidelity was the religion of the great, the refined, and the learned; where a man of a certain rank in society who should believe in Christianity, would have been marvelled at, as one would in these days who should express a faith in witchcraft or astrology, or hunt after the philosopher's stone, or the *elixir vitæ*, or attempt the perpetual motion. Religion was looked upon as a useful institution to government and society—like *soup maigre* and black bread, as an excellent thing for the poor, but with which the rich and the enlightened had no more to do than with those unsavory articles of diet.

The infidelity of the philosophers of France was the state of mind with which the study of science was entered upon, and not the state of mind produced by the study. They went to these pursuits, *expecting* to find in them confirmations, or at least illustrations of their previous notions; but it is no new thing that men should find confirmations of preconceived opinions, where they do not really exist. How has it been with the bible? Have not men disposed to infidelity, found, as they thought, even in this sacred volume, marks of its falsehood? Have they not thus been confirmed in their opinions from the very source whence they should have been removed?

But how was it with the skepticism of the Scottish school? Did not the metaphysical studies of Hume and his followers do as much towards creating a skeptical tendency in them, as the study of physical science among the French philosophers? Shall we therefore reproach the study of mind itself with a tendency to the production of infidelity? Certainly not. They are simply coincidences.

Sciences which proceed upon the examination of facts, tend necessarily to the production, in sound minds, of great carefulness in the admission of evidence, and great moderation in yielding assent to results; that is to say, of a predisposition to doubt. It would follow, of course, that men, all whose studies tend to illustrate to them the unalterable character of the laws of the universe, the permanence of the principles upon which all the operations of the material world proceed, must approach Christianity as a system essentially improbable, from its being founded on miracles, and would examine it as if they expected it would prove false. This being the case, it is remarkable how many

men of profound research in physical science, have been firm and devoted believers in Christianity, from examination. Not to mention names of less note, there are Newton and Haller, both men whose whole lives were devoted to science, the very disciples of the inductive philosophy, and yet as remarkable for their piety as their science. It is not to be pretended that scientific men have been generally religious, or have been interested in religion. Like the majority of mankind, having their attention concentrated upon a favorite pursuit, they have had no time to spare. But here science does no more than any other occupation, equally engrossing in its nature, to estrange the mind from religion. The love of fame, of wealth, of pleasure, all do it as much or more. We do not contend that philosophy alone tends to make men religious; we only contend that it has no essential tendency to make them irreligious.

The existence of loose notions on the subject of religion among physical philosophers, no more shows that this is the tendency of the pursuits themselves, than the existence of wild theories upon the subjects of the sciences shows that the study of science has an unfavorable effect upon the intellectual powers. Their speculations in matters of religion have been no more absurd than their speculations in matters of science. In past days, with all the love of philosophy which existed, there existed a very unphilosophical mode of speculation with regard to the causes of things which have no connexion with religion. The approach to the true method of reasoning has been gradual; and it has hardly yet been completely reached. The habit of men of science has often been to imagine or invent a set of secondary causes, which, on their theory, were sufficient to produce the phenomena of nature, and by fixing the mind strongly upon them and referring all phenomena to them, they came at length to consider any other ultimate cause as unnecessary. Thus gravity, or heat, was the result of the agency of a certain fluid; and the motions of this were produced by an attenuated ether; the motions of this were caused by a general law of nature, and thus they went on, pushing the difficulty farther from them, and putting the elephant on the tortoise, and the tortoise on the snake, to the end of the chapter.

As a striking example of the mode of accounting for phenomena to which they are reduced who endeavour to ascribe to nature alone what belongs to God, we quote from the Entomology of Kirby and Spence, the following passage in which the writer is giving an account of the theory of Lamarck contained in his *Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres*. 'He supposes

that the webfooted birds acquired their natatory feet, by frequently separating their toes as far as possible from each other in their efforts to swim. Thus the skin that unites these toes at their base contracted a habit of stretching itself; and thus in time the webfoot of the duck and goose was produced. The waders, which in order to procure their food must stand in the water, but do not love to swim, from their constant efforts to keep their bodies from submersion, were in the habit of always stretching their legs with this view, till they grew long enough to save them the trouble!' 'He attributes the long neck of the camelopard to its efforts to reach the boughs of the mimosa, which, after the lapse of a few thousand years, it effected!' He speaks also of 'one of the molusca, which, as it moved along, felt an inclination to explore, by means of touch, the bodies in its path. For this purpose it caused the nervous and other fluids to move in masses successively to certain points of its head, and thus in process of time it acquired its horns and tentacula!'* The motto of such a philosopher might well have been, *Delendus est Deus*; yet it is to be particularly remarked, that, in this extract, the religion is not worse than the philosophy, and that such philosophy requires a degree of faith a thousand times greater than Christianity. Yet we doubt not that Lamarck would have looked on a believer as a very credulous person.

There is another point in which some very good, no doubt, but certainly very weak men, have thought science might be injurious to the cause of religion. They are afraid that philosophers, in pushing their investigations into the hidden things of nature, will make some discoveries, or imagine and teach that they have made discoveries, which will be inconsistent with the disclosures of revelation, and will contradict the scriptures. This is an old source of alarm. The cry, 'Religion is in danger,' has often been raised on occasion of great and remarkable discoveries in science. Reformation in matters of science, has hardly been better tolerated by the predominant church, than in those of religion. The Copernican system made its way against papal bulls and the thunder of the church, and Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood, created a no less sensible, though less injurious alarm in a Protestant land. Yet these discoveries have now become incorporated with the most familiar of our knowledge; and what is religion the worse for it? One would have supposed that the time for such stupid bigotry had passed away; but even at the present day there are those

* Introduction to Entomology, vol. iii. p. 351.

who have taken alarm at the surprising discoveries in geology which have been lately made, and are fearful that doubt may be thrown by them upon the scripture account of the creation.

But for our part we have no sympathy with those who hold their faith in revelation by so feeble a tenure as this; who fear that the revealed truth of God cannot stand the test of the scrutiny of man into his works in the natural world. Truly may they be said to hold their belief in unbelief—to hold the truths of religion as though they doubted the foundation on which they stand. Revelation does not fear examination of any kind. It invites and can endure any test. It only asks that men will examine it; will do it justice, without partiality and without favor.

But we may ask what are, or can be, the ideas of such men with regard to the nature of revelation? Do they believe that God has revealed any thing inconsistent with his works, whether past or present? Do they believe that the truths of revelation, *can* be inconsistent with the truths of nature? The position is preposterous. Revelation does not create truth, it only discloses it. It makes no difference in the actual existence or relations of things. It is a matter of necessity therefore, if revelation be true, that all discoveries in science must confirm it. All physical truth must be at least not contradictory to revealed truth. If, therefore, false conclusions are arrived at, which seem to clash with revelation, we must trust to the progress of knowledge to set them right; for if the fear of sometimes failing in pursuit of truth, is to deter us from the search, what is to become of all efforts for the improvement of our species, in knowledge, in virtue, and in happiness?

We do not mean that he who studies the philosophy of nature will necessarily become religious, let him penetrate ever so deeply into her secrets, and attain to ever so large an amount of physical knowledge. There are two ways of studying it—two ways of looking at it. Much will depend upon the views and feelings which a man brings to the study; whether he approaches it as a religious being, or simply seeks the gratification of that love of knowledge which is so strong a propensity in man. A good deal of the effect of every pursuit, depends on circumstances incidental in their nature. It is notorious that the study of the bible itself, has been made the business of a life, without making it a religious and holy one; and many of the ministers of Christianity have been anything rather than devout and pious Christians. It is sufficient for our purpose if we show that the study of physical philosophy, if entered upon with a religious disposition and made subservient to a religious purpose, is fitted

to elevate the mind, to help us in our conceptions of divine things, to strengthen our faith in the reality of the attributes of God and the truths of revelation, and, as a natural consequence of all these, to create and perpetuate in the soul that deep and real devotion which is the very constitution and essence of a religious character.

A knowledge of the progress which has been made in the physical sciences, gives us elevated views of the dignity and worth of our nature. We know of nothing, indeed, which is better adapted to fill our minds with wonder, joy, and gratitude than a contemplation of the triumphs achieved by man in his investigations into the history and laws of the material world. We may well be grateful and proud that we belong to a species which has been gifted by God with intellectual capacities of so noble a character. Only consider what man is and what he has accomplished. An animal barely superior in physical structure and constitution to the other animals about him, destitute of their directing instincts and their means of defence and protection, wholly dependant on the exertions of his reason for the supply of his natural wants—he has by the aid of this reason compassed the knowledge of sea, earth, and heaven. Confined entirely to the surface of this earth, he has penetrated, by means of instruments of his own invention, into the remotest recesses of space. He has read the laws, and defined the motions, not only of our own planet, and of the system with which it is connected, but of myriads of other systems at distances inconceivable and immeasurable. In the discovery of minute things he has been no less successful. By the aid of the microscope he has brought to light a world of objects, as far removed from his senses by their minuteness, as the heavenly bodies by their distance. He perceives forests of plants of various sizes and kinds, where the naked eye sees but a speck of mould, and myriads of animals living, moving, and enjoying life, where it beholds only a drop of colorless liquid. In another direction, he has, in chemistry, pushed his inquiries with no less success, into things equally remote from common perception. By the invention of instruments and the discovery of means of investigation, he has unravelled many of the secrets of the composition of matter, and forced asunder the very elements of which it is composed. By the application of the wonderful powers of electricity and galvanism, which are probably to be regarded as only the results of certain modifications of chemical affinity, he has, as it were, turned the powers of nature against herself, and converted those very energies by which the component parts of bodies are con-

nected, into means of separating them. By the invention and application of means and instruments purely mechanical, he has been able also to control and direct the powerful tendencies of some of the most violent of all agents, the elastic fluids. Thus the gases have been liquified, and converted into fluids like water. The fire-damp, that inflammable gas whose awful explosions have been productive, in the coal mines, of such extensive and desolating effects, has been deprived of its terrors, and instead of a destroyer has been rendered a friend, being actually impressed into the service of the miner, as a light to his path and a lamp to his feet. The giant power of steam has also been subdued, and this tremendous agent is now the manageable companion of his labors, and turns the wheel or plies the oar at the command of man.

No science, probably, more than geology, short as has been its existence as a distinct subject of inquiry, displays the immense capacity of the human mind in its power of penetrating into the knowledge of the dim, the distant, and obscure, and of bringing to light truths which time and circumstance would seem to have removed forever from the grasp of the human understanding. To those who are not familiar with any of those discoveries, it will not be too great a departure from our subject, to say, that the province of this science is to read the history of the earth, just as astronomy reads the history of the stars. As in the one case, the astronomer, by his processes of calculation, looks back into the history of the heavens and determines what the motions and changes of the heavenly bodies have been for an indefinite period of the past; so, in the other case, the geologist, by processes of investigation, less certain in the present state of knowledge, but not perhaps in their nature, reads the history of the revolutions to which the earth's surface has been subjected, in the hills, valleys, and rocks, which, to the uninitiated eye, seem but shapeless and promiscuous monuments of some former desolation.

He finds that the crust of the earth, by which we mean that part he has been enabled to explore, is not composed of a mass of uniform materials; neither, on the contrary, is it a confused collection of heterogeneous substances. With disorder there is order; or rather the remains of an order which has once been. It is composed of strata, or layers, of different composition and different origin; not now regularly laid one upon another, but broken up and separated into pieces, and yet each retaining its peculiar distinctive marks. The relative antiquity of these strata is determined by considerations amounting almost to de-

monstration, but which it would require too much room to explain here. In the very oldest no remains of vegetable or animal life are found, whilst in the more recent they exist in great abundance.*

A key has been lately found, by the perseverance and ingenuity and learning of a few individuals, to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, which have so long set at defiance the researches of philosophers, and were supposed to contain treasures of ancient knowledge. In some sort, we may regard these organic remains as natural hieroglyphics, to which we need only the key to come into the possession of most valuable truths. The earth is full of them, and they have for ages puzzled the inquirers into nature as strange anomalies. But now the natural history of these remains is to geology what mathematics is to astronomy—an instrument of incalculable power in the discovery of truth. To so high a degree of excellence has it been carried, that from these imperfect remains of vegetables and animals, naturalists are generally able to determine the kind of plant or animal, and how far they resembled any of those species which are now on the earth.

By applying this science to the successive examination of the organic remains discovered in the different strata, geologists have found that the most ancient strata, that is, the most ancient which contain organic remains, present traces only of marine plants and animals, and those of the very lowest kinds; that, as we advance to the more recent strata, we find land plants and animals, at first of the lowest kinds, then of those somewhat more perfect in structure, and so as we pass from one stratum to another, those which are higher and higher in the scale—at last even those which approach nearest to us of the animal kingdom, but nowhere the remains of man himself, except upon the present surface of the earth.

Now what inferences does geology draw from these facts? That by a series of revolutions the earth's surface has been successively renovated for an indefinite number of times; that, after each revolution, the standard of organization was raised, and new races of animals called into existence, till at last man was created, the latest and most perfect of the works of God, the consummation of the material creation. We say geology in its present state, forces these conclusions upon our minds, and that so far from contradicting, they confirm the Mosaic account

* To these remains of plants and animals the term *organic remains*, is now usually applied in the language of science; *fossil remains* is also sometimes used, though less now than formerly.

of the creation, and of the period assigned for it; for, if there be any one truth more than another settled by this science, it is that of the recent date of the present state of the earth's surface, and the recent residence of man upon it. It is not necessary to our belief in the scripture account that we should believe that the earth was formed, as to its inorganic materials, at the same period with man. This account itself seems rather to indicate the prior creation of matter, and a succession of great and important changes preceding, and making way for the introduction of our own species. Every analogy with the general course of the providence of God, leads to the same conclusion. Every analogy indicates that the principle of his economy is a gradual progress towards perfection by the use of means; that no end is attained at once, by a sudden step, but by a course of preparation and through a series of changes. Such seems to have been the case with our globe. Millions of years it may have revolved in its orbit, uninhabited by plants or animals, passing through a series of revolutions merely chemical and mechanical; and millions more may have elapsed from the first appearance of life upon it, to its arrival at the present stage of its onward progress.

Such are some of the discoveries in science which illustrate the immense reach of the human intellect. And these, it is to be remarked, have not been the result of extraordinary talents alone. It is not merely the highly gifted and exalted in genius, who have sought out and laid open rich sources of knowledge. These are researches to which the minds of all men are competent. The success which has attended them has been mainly the reward of ardor, industry, perseverance, and diligence, united with not more than an average share of intellectual power. True, there have been great men at all times who have led the way, like pillars of fire, in the march of discovery; but the greater part of what has been accomplished in science, does not imply the exertion of extraordinary powers. Great minds go before the age in which they live, and, reaching forward into futurity, seize upon discoveries which would have been the legitimate property of a subsequent age. In this way they hasten the course of improvement, but nothing more. Time and the industrious application of ordinary talents, would in due season accomplish as much.

It will be perceived that the immense amount of knowledge at which man has arrived, has not been acquired directly by his unassisted powers, but by the gradual invention or discovery and application to his studies, of certain instruments of investiga-

tion. The difference between the infant and the adult, we apprehend, does not consist in the nature and degree of their intellectual powers, so much as in the degree in which each understands the use of his instruments of acquiring knowledge; namely, his limbs and senses. As the infant grows up to manhood he gradually acquires the use of these, and by their use the field of his knowledge and the extent of his acquisitions are increased. And so with our race. It has grown up from generation to generation, not by any actual increase of intellectual powers, any new developments of mind, but simply by the accumulation of the means of acquiring knowledge; which means may be denominated, as we have already called them, instruments of investigation. Thus, in astronomy, he has aided his natural powers of vision by the telescope, which increases their extent, and by the quadrant, sextant, &c. which increase their accuracy. These, however, are not the only kind of instruments. Equally important ones are found in the various sciences which are subservient to the calculations of the astronomer; such as arithmetic, geometry, algebra, fluxions. Thus, too, in geology, as has been already remarked, the natural history of organic remains, is an essential instrument of investigation.

It will be universally found that the progress of knowledge has kept pace with the application of these means of investigation. We make no conquests till we have provided ourselves with weapons. And it will be found, we think, from an attentive consideration of the course taken by the human mind in the discovery of truth, that there is no limit to its progress, except that which is fixed by the nature of the instruments it employs. The capacity is indefinite; the powers are kept down by the habitation in which they are placed, and the tools which are given them to work with. We said above that science led us to the most elevated views of the nature, dignity, and destiny of man; we repeat the remark. The views which have been taken confirm it. The knowledge of many a youth in modern times would seem almost superhuman to the wisest of the ancient philosophers; and yet all the difference has arisen from the accumulation of the means of acquiring knowledge. There is no reason why our race should not continue to go on as it has gone on, indefinitely improving, even in the present state of existence; and if we suppose ourselves endowed in another state, with new means of learning truth, new instruments of investigation, there can probably be no limit to the height of knowledge at which we may hope to arrive.

But while these considerations should lead us to value, very highly, the nature which it has pleased God to give us, it does by no means follow, that it should produce in our minds, any undue selfreliance, or any extravagant emotions of pride. In fact no more humbling spectacle can be imagined than that of the human character as it now is, compared with the human character as it might be. We see a world filled with beings, all of them capable of the most elevated acquisitions of knowledge, but actually existing in a state of the most debased and deplorable ignorance; capable of the sublimest emotions of piety and devotion, and of the most exalted efforts of virtue, but actually the slaves of superstition and crime. We glory to think of what man might be, and may be; we mourn when we think of what he is.

We are aware that there are many who estimate so very highly the value of the powers and functions of mind, that they view with a sort of contempt everything relating to matter, as unworthy the contemplation of an intellectual being. The spiritual world to them is all in all; the material, perishable and transitory. This mistaken view is produced by considering the material world merely in its connexion with our existence in the present state. To us, material things, that is, the material scene in which we live, is perishable and transitory. But in themselves they are not so. So far as we can judge, matter and the laws of matter, are as permanent as those of mind. The laws of matter as much proceed from, and are kept up by the constant influence of the Deity as the laws of spirit; and they are a proper subject of interest for the very reason that they do proceed from him, and afford present proofs of his continual agency. What! shall we say that any one part of the creation of God is less worthy of him than another, or less worthy of being understood by his creatures? Are not all its parts so connected with, and dependant upon one another, that no one can be perfectly and entirely understood without the rest?

And besides, this aversion to the study of the material universe is produced by a wrong view of the relation of matter and mind. It supposes that they are of opposite natures, existing in us in a forced state of union, from which mind ought always to rejoice to be set free as from a prison. But we do not so read, either what nature, or religion teaches us. We cannot conceive, we do not say of their separate existence, but of either separately constituting the universe. Matter, in regard to mind, stands in the relation of material to power. We see and know and can conceive of no exhibitions of spiritual power, except as connect-

ed with matter. When we study natural philosophy, or chemistry, or astronomy, what do our minds dwell upon? Matter, brute matter? No, certainly; but upon the manifestations of mind, of intelligence, as displayed in matter. And so of all physical studies. In this point of view the structure of material objects in general, and of these bodies of ours themselves, frail and perishable as they are, is worthy of attentive study as an intellectual occupation, as elevating the intellectual standard. It is very easy to talk of this vile body, and to speak with contempt of all carnal things. But it is man's fault if his body is put to vile uses, and if all his carnal doings are abominable. It does not therefore follow that his body, as the handy work of God, is either vile or contemptible. We are fearfully and wonderfully made. And though individually our bodies decay and pass into dust, yet the laws of organization by which they become fit habitations for an intellectual being, are permanent, and can never be understood without filling us with admiration. It is no more to the credit of a man's understanding than of his heart, that he can study such things in their merely material relation; since true philosophy, no less than religion, teaches us to regard them in a relation which gives them a deeper, and more intense, and more permanent interest.

For, what is the object and the aim of true philosophy? Is it not to know things as they really are? to push the investigation of truth as far back among the hidden connexions of things as the nature of our powers will admit? to establish a theory which shall account for as many of the facts in any case placed before it as is possible? Imagine then the universe as it is, to be a problem given to the philosopher to solve—to provide a theory for. Then compare the theory of the religious philosopher, with that of the mere philosopher of matter. Who best accounts for the facts of the case, and who does it most simply? Is it not the religious philosopher? We do not say that he leaves no difficulties unexplained, no objections unanswered; for when was this ever done with regard to any subject? But are not his incomparably less in number than those of his competitor? True philosophy never stops short of the relation which all the phenomena of the universe bear to the Supreme Being and First Cause of all things. And this tendency in philosophic minds, is shown by that love for the study of final causes, which is always so prominent a characteristic of them. That the most eminent men of science have hitherto regarded this subject as we would have it regarded, we do not pretend. Still, this is not a greater mistake with respect to the ends and purposes of their studies,

than they have been constantly making in other respects. But in all respects they now better understand the proper mode and objects of study. Men have improved and are to improve, not more in the knowledge of the true mode of acquiring the truths of nature, than in a knowledge of the proper application of those truths, and of the results to be drawn from them. A brighter day is dawning in science. Its real tendencies are getting to be better understood. We trust that the time is coming when it is to render service to religion, as well as to the arts of life, and to aid man in his spiritual welfare and in the christian race, as much as it now benefits him in his temporal concerns.

Rightly studied—and we trust we have in the course of these observations sufficiently explained what we mean by this—rightly studied, the philosophy of nature is adapted to have none but the most happy influence upon our religious views, character, and conduct. There is something in such studies which helps to bring the mind into that calm and serene state, which, although it does not constitute a religious frame, is yet essential to its existence in its greatest purity and perfection. Other pursuits bring us constantly into contact with the bad parts of the human character—make us inevitably, to a greater or less degree, the witnesses of bad passions, of unholy propensities, of revolting crimes. It is delightful to return from such scenes as the world exhibits, into that quiet and soothing seclusion which these studies may afford us, where the winds and waves of contention assail us in vain, and the mind, lifting itself up into a region where everything temporal and mortal is left far below, breathes unalloyed and untainted the pure atmosphere of nature, and feasts itself upon the contemplation of that which speaks only of the ever present, the infinite and eternal wisdom, power, and goodness of the Great Father of all things.

And what can contribute more than contemplations like these to that spirit of devotion, which, as we have already intimated, is in fact the essential and fundamental principle of all religious feeling? What so much as a strong conception of the ever working energy of God in the natural world, his constant and almost visible agency in all its operations, can promote a lively sense of the same superintending providence in the spiritual world? What so much as a perception of the necessary dependence of the whole physical creation upon his continual care, can impress upon us a corresponding perception of the same dependence upon him of his intellectual and moral creation? This is the soul of philosophy, as well as the soul of religion, and each in its perfection is inseparable from the other.

Devotion does not consist in, and is not constituted by any acts or series of acts of adoration and prayer. It is a habit of the mind, an affection of the soul, which should be just as much a constant and unintermitting element in its existence, as any of the affections or emotions of an inferior nature, which refer themselves to any of the relations of life. A man loves his father or his children when absent, as much as when present—when thinking of something else, as much as when thinking of them. And so is it with devotion to God. It is wrought into the whole constitution, it becomes an integral part of the character. It is the attraction of the spiritual world. It is a sentiment felt by the mind towards the Great Centre of the universe, just as the power of attraction is felt by the bodies of the physical world. It exists when no external act of adoration or worship is engaged in, just as gravity would continue equally strong though bodies never moved. Prayer is only the occasional exhibition or indulgence of that which is the prevailing emotion of the mind. And the philosopher, to whose mind every exhibition of the mysterious powers of nature suggests ideas of the existence and attributes and providence of his Creator, renders thus an ascription of praise, as acceptable to God and as improving to his own heart, as if it had been formed into words, and uttered in the house of worship.

Not that we are to undervalue the importance, we may say the imperative necessity to the human mind, in its present state of existence, of actual prayer. Though devotion does not consist merely or principally in this act, it does not exist without it. No truly devout man can refrain from it. Devotion excites to prayer, and prayer nourishes and keeps alive devotion. Yet, as on the one hand there may be devotion without prayer, so on the other there is prayer without devotion. The most devout men are not perhaps always those who pray the most, or at least who are *known* to pray the most. Now even the mere physical beauties of the external world, operate strongly upon religious minds to excite feelings of devotion; how much more then must the knowledge of those hidden, but sublime truths, which give to nature a spiritual essence, of those beauties which pass the sense and are perceived only by the soul, excite in a properly educated mind a kindred sentiment!

We have endeavoured, feebly, we fear, to express a few of our sentiments upon what we esteem a most important subject. We have endeavoured to excite some interest, in religious minds, in that which is now attracting, and is destined still more to attract a large proportion of the attention of the world. The study of

the physical sciences is fast becoming one of the occupations or the amusements of an important portion of mankind, and in their application to the arts they are adapted to produce as great an influence upon the aspect of human affairs, upon the relative greatness and intelligence of nations, as any other cause. We know, for we have seen, what effects they will bring about in the increase of wealth and power and means of enjoyment; but it remains yet to be seen what they are to do for man as a moral and religious being;—whether their influence is to be nothing or worse than nothing, or whether it is to be made, as it may be made, of positive advantage. They will, we think, inevitably become an instrument of great power. It remains to be seen whether it shall be wielded by the foes or the friends of revealed truth;—whether it shall be permitted, in the hands of its foes, to strike a deadly blow at its vital interests, or, in those of its friends, to become at once the shield and the sword by which its adversaries are to be foiled and its triumphs secured.

ART. II.—*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. In two Volumes.* By MOSES STUART, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature, in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Vol. I. Andover, 1827. 8vo.

[Continued from vol. iv. p. 519.]

WE resume the subject which we left unfinished in our last number; namely, THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. The argument which we shall now bring forward to show that its author was not St Paul, involves a topic of great moment;—the question, upon what principles, and for what purposes, quotations from the Jewish scriptures were adduced by the different writers of the New Testament. The importance of this topic must have been perceived by every one who has undertaken to examine it, and has reflected upon its various bearings. Obstacles, almost insuperable, have for fourteen centuries been opposed to all free and rational investigation of every subject illustrating the history and character of Christianity. Worthless, therefore, as are most of the discussions of those subjects, yet we know of no branch of inquiry, which has been treated in a manner more confused, superficial, and unsatisfactory, than the question respecting the quotations from the Old Testament found in the New. The attentive reader of the scriptures can have proceeded but a little way

in the Gospel of Matthew, without being greatly perplexed by the manner in which he finds the words of the Old Testament alleged. But there is no book to be pointed out to him, affording a satisfactory solution of his difficulties. In illustrating the argument respecting the authorship of the Epistle, now to be stated, it will be necessary to consider at some length the subject just adverted to.

This argument is, that *St Paul and the writer to the Hebrews differ widely from each other in their prevailing mode of interpreting the Jewish scriptures, in the use which they make, in reasoning, of passages from those scriptures, and in their style of reasoning generally.*

This is a subject which cannot be fully understood without attending to some preliminary considerations.

Strict philosophical reasoning is one of the last products of a highly disciplined intellect in a very improved state of society; *the final attainment of long continued effort.* To be generally determined in our opinions by reason alone, or in other words, by considerations presented to the understanding only, is to have arrived at a very high degree of intellectual superiority. Opinion, or belief, for the most part, is the result of impressions made on the imagination, the feelings, or the passions. Much which has the appearance of reasoning, is only a mode of presenting a topic in such a manner, as that, through some principle or other of our nature, the desired effect may be produced.—It is verbal, depending upon the ambiguous sense of words, which a writer may arrange ingeniously into propositions that look like arguments, and thus deceive his readers and himself.—It is drawn from striking, loose, insufficient analogies, with which the imagination is amused and occupied, while the understanding sleeps.—It is baseless; there are no principles on which it rests; yet there is an array and connexion of thoughts, which may occupy the mind, so as to exclude the perception that they depend not upon acknowledged truths, but upon mere assumptions.—It produces a series of vivid conceptions; and though vivid conception is not, as it has been said to be, belief, yet we readily pass from it to the opinion, that what presents itself to our apprehension in such well defined lineaments and permanent colors, must have a real existence.—It addresses the passions and prejudices; it flatters and excites them; and the judgment is not permitted to examine the pretences which they sieze upon.—That it is the business of the reasoner to address the understanding only, and to consider only what will bear the eye of pure intellect, and that by such reasoning alone our belief ought to be determined, are

principles, which never have been practically recognized to any considerable extent. To repeat what has in effect been said before, if we were to judge of reasoning from very much which has borne that name in ancient times, and in our own also, it might be defined the art of possessing the mind, through the medium of any of its faculties, with a particular conception, which may affect the feelings and character as if it were conformed to truth. The person who admits it, feels and acts as if it were so. It becomes his way of thinking. He feels and acts as a wise man ought to do, who had perceived it to be true through an exercise of intellect.

Hence, it may be remarked, follows much uncertainty in the history of philosophy and of the progress of the human mind. Opinions produced in the manner described, now assume a substantial form as matters of proper faith, and now fade away till they become, or seem to become, shadowy and unreal conceptions. The provinces of the imagination and the intellect are confounded; they exercise a joint reign; and it is often difficult or impossible to say what should be regarded as a proposition actually believed, and what, as a mere fanciful conception, in which the mind indulges, as having probably some general correspondence to the truth.

Reasoning of the kind which has been described, appears under a wholly different aspect, as viewed by him to whose mind it is adapted, and by another at the distance of two thousand years, whose habits of thinking have been formed under very different influences. It is, as if, in the common experiment in optics with a cylindrical mirror, one were looking at the regular, and perhaps beautiful image reflected by the glass, and another at the confused mass of colors and deformed shape of the picture before it. In order to form a just estimate of ancient writings, we must go back to the time when they were produced, and place ourselves in the situation of those by whom and for whom they were written. As regards the reasoning of the ancients, we must make a due allowance for all the improvement which has been attained in that difficult art during the last two or three centuries; and likewise for all the knowledge which has been acquired, for all the truths which have been ascertained, all the errors which have been exploded, and all the principles which have been settled, during the same period.

These considerations apply to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Among his contemporaries, he was probably distinguished for his intellectual powers. But his reasoning cannot be regarded as of any force by an intelligent reader of the pres-

ent day. It is difficult so far to accommodate our minds to the conceptions and principles of the author and his cotemporaries, as to perceive how it was adapted to produce any effect at the time when it was written. It belongs to the Alexandrine and Rabbinical schools. It is founded, for the most part, upon the Old Testament; but not upon the language of the Old Testament taken in its obvious sense, and interpreted upon common principles. On the contrary, after the fashion of the Jews of his time, the writer deduces from its words hidden and mystical senses, and strange and unfounded inferences, which he adapts to his purpose. The Jews believed that the Old Testament, beside the meaning which it presented when understood according to the common use of language, was full of other thoughts, lying deeper and more precious. They regarded its words as containing different meanings, one within another, of which the most obvious, that expressed by the words taken according to their common acceptation, was often comparatively worthless. To those imaginary senses, and to the style of interpretation by which they are educed, the epithet *allegorical* has been technically applied.* The allegorical mode of interpretation was familiar to the Jews before the introduction of Christianity. From the first it prevailed among Christians; and though condemned by Luther, continued to be practised till long after the Reformation. We find, indeed, considerable remains of it at the present day, in notions respecting types, prefigurations, and a double sense of prophecy, and in the opinion that the Song of Solomon is a sacred allegory. The mystical, secondary senses ascribed to the words of scripture by this mode of interpretation, were in their nature arbitrary and fanciful. Of those employed by the writer to the Hebrews, many appear to have rested on traditional authority in the Rabbinical schools, and so far to have afforded support for a show of reasoning. Others he seems to have thought were sufficiently recommended by their intrinsic probability, and apparent coincidence with the truth.

The remote occasion of the allegorical style of interpretation is to be found, perhaps, in the custom, which, in early times, prevailed throughout the East and Egypt, of expressing abstract truths and historical facts in allegories, parables, dark sayings, symbols, and such figures as could not be understood by one

* In this use of the word, conformably to its etymology in Greek, it is taken in a more extensive sense than usual. An *allegorical* meaning is *any* supposed mystical meaning, answering in some sort to the true meaning of a passage, whether that passage be literal or figurative; whether it be regarded as a proper allegory, in the common English sense of the term, or not. *Allegorical interpretation* is the process by which such supposed meanings are educed.

unacquainted with their conventional use. It was applied by heathen philosophers to the fables of their mythology. They maintained that, notwithstanding the grossness of the images presented, these fables, having a hidden meaning, were designed to express important truths. By the Jews, from various causes, on which it would be out of place here to dwell, this mode of interpretation was applied to their sacred books, and formed one branch of what was called the Cabbala. A few passages from ancient and modern authors may serve to illustrate its prevalence among this people, and the character which it assumed.

Philo, the Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, was cotemporary with our Saviour, though he appears to have been wholly unacquainted with Christianity. He has left us an account of a class of Jews, who led a monastic, religious life, whom he denominates Therapeutæ, and who were a branch of the Essenes.* They are spoken of by Philo with great admiration and respect. In this account, he says of them;†—'The whole interval between dawn and evening is occupied in mental exercise. For being engaged in the study of the sacred writings, they philosophize according to the system of their ancestors, interpreting them allegorically; regarding the words as symbolic, expressing something of a hidden nature, which is propounded in allegories. They have likewise compositions of ancient men, who, being among the leaders of their sect, left many monuments of the allegorical art, which they use as exemplars, imitating the method therein adopted.'

The Therapeutæ, at their meals, conferred respecting the sense of scripture. Of these conferences, Philo says;‡—'Their expositions of the sacred writings are of hidden senses allegorically expressed. For the whole Law seems to these men to resemble an animal. The written commands they consider as its body, and the unseen sense which resides in the words, as its soul. By means of this, the rational soul begins clearly to see what belongs to its nature, reflected, as it were, by the mirror of the words; beholding the exceeding beauty of the thoughts contained in them, and unfolding and unveiling the symbols, and bringing their meaning naked to the light, for those who are able, upon a slight suggestion, to perceive what is not apparent by means of what is apparent.'

Philo himself, throughout his works, abounds in allegorical expositions of the Old Testament. He, however, differs widely

* See Philo, De Vita Contemplativa. Opp. II. p. 471. Ed. Mang.
† Ibid. pp. 475, 476. ‡ Ibid. pp. 483, 484.

from the Rabbinical writers in applying no passages, either in a literal or mystical sense, to the Messiah. This, perhaps, may be accounted for by the circumstance, that he was writing among Gentiles, with a view, probably, of being read by them, quite as much as by his countrymen. From his works it is evident, that the mode of interpreting the Old Testament adopted by him, was nothing new in his time; for he neither explains nor defends its principles. It may here be observed, that there are such correspondences of thought and expression between Philo and the writer to the Hebrews, as to create a strong presumption, that the latter was acquainted with the writings of the former. In this, there is nothing improbable, but perhaps the coincidences mentioned may be explained, by supposing that they each derived thoughts and expressions from a school of philosophy common to both.

In the Proem to his Antiquities of the Jews, Josephus thus speaks of the contents of the Pentateuch;—'All things are disposed in harmony with the nature of the Universe; some things being expressed by the lawgiver skilfully in enigmas, some in decent allegories, and whatever it was preferable should be readily understood, in plain words. To those who are desirous of becoming acquainted with the principles of all this, there is a wide field for truly philosophical speculation. This I now pass over; but if God give me time, I will endeavour to treat of it, after finishing the present work.'

Unfortunately, the work proposed by Josephus was never accomplished.

We pass to the Rabbinical Doctors; and will first quote Lightfoot, than whom no one is more celebrated for his Rabbinical learning, and the use which he has made of it. He says of the Jewish teachers;*—'As to the written Law, they had a twofold way of declaring it; viz. explaining and applying it according to the literal sense of it, or else by drawing allegories, mysteries, and far-fecht notions out of it. As to the latter, the instances are endless in the Jewish writings everywhere, so far that they have even melted down the whole volume of the scriptures into tradition and allegory.'

The following is from Father Simon's account of the Jewish expositors in his Critical History of the Old Testament.†—'The mode of explaining holy scripture adopted by the Jews, has been different at different times and in different places. Though in their disputes with Christians, they keep sufficiently close to

* Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ, note on Luke x. 25.
† Hist. Crit. V. T. Liv. III. ch. v.

the literal sense; yet in their ancient commentaries upon the bible, we find nothing but allegories, fanciful conceits, fictions, and some moral reflections. They seldom give their attention to discovering the literal sense; they are wholly bent upon inventing parables and allegories.'

Allix, in his Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians, once a famous book, undertakes to maintain the three following propositions;—1. 'That in the times of Jesus Christ Our Blessed Saviour, the Jews had among them a common Explication of the scriptures of the Old Testament, grounded on the Tradition of their Fathers, which was in many things approved by Christ and his Apostles.—2. That the Jews had certain traditional maxims and rules for understanding the scripture.—3. That Jesus Christ and his Apostles proved divers points of the Christian Doctrine by this common Traditional Exposition received among the Jews, which they could not have done (at least not so well), had there been only such a Literal Sense of those Texts which they alleged, as we can find without the help of such Exposition.'

The last proposition may serve in part to show the bearings of the subject before us, and how necessary it is to have clear and correct ideas concerning it.

Schoeltgen, in the two volumes of his *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, gives examples of the allegorical expositions of the Jews. In one passage, after producing various specimens of their Cabbalistic interpretation of the Old Testament, he makes the following remarks;*—1. 'What opinion is to be formed of this kind of Cabbala appears from what has been said; seeing that it has pleased the Holy Spirit sometimes to use the same method as the sober Cabbalists; as for example in the Epistle to the Galatians, where the inspired author applies the history of Sarah and Hagar and their two children to the two covenants. If we could not oppose this shield, perhaps others would think this kind of interpretation worthless.†—2. 'This exegetical Cab-

* Tom. II. p. 48.

† Respecting the authority to be ascribed to the allegorical expositions of the Jews, the opinions of Schoeltgen appear to have been unsettled. In his note on the passage in Galatians, which he refers to above, he remarks;—'Much might here be said of the Jewish allegories, which they bring forward continually in their Cabbalistic commentaries. At the present day we must be cautious in searching for such allegories. For the apostle [St Paul] has selected but a few out of a great number of histories; and even these are not conclusive, except as *argumenta ad homines*. They were adapted to the Jews of those times, or even to recent converts from that nation; but not to us Christians. They were written for our benefit, that ministers of the divine word might hence learn, that it is not unlawful to use arguments which are extraneous, and adapted only to particular individuals. They may likewise, at the present day, be of the same use in confuting Jews, as they were in the time of the apostle.'

bala shows, that the ancient Jews diligently sought for the Messiah and his church in various types both of persons and things, so as to arrive in many respects to a more intimate knowledge of him.—3. Nor was this mode of interpretation applied to histories only, but likewise to other passages of the Old Testament. Thus in Exodus, iv. 22, God calls his people Israel, *his first born son*, which words have been applied to the Messiah, not by the Jews alone, but by the evangelist Matthew himself.'

Among the personages of the Old Testament, who were supposed by the Jews to be types of the Messiah, David was preeminent. The language in which he speaks of himself in the Psalms, and the declarations made concerning him, were applied by the Jews, whenever the case would admit, in what was esteemed a higher and more complete sense, to the Messiah. It is from this source that Christians have derived the notion, that the Psalms contain many prophecies of Christ.

To the passages which have been quoted, we will add but one more, from the preface to the Epistle to the Hebrews by Beausobre, in the very valuable French translation of the New Testament by him and Lenfant. He says;*—'From the very commencement of this epistle, the reader finds passages of the Old Testament alleged by way of proof, which are explained in a manner that surprises him, because, upon considering them in their original connexion, the sense given them by the sacred writer is not to be perceived. It is in consequence necessary to make some remarks upon the mode of explaining the ancient scriptures mystically, which was followed by the apostles, and afterwards imitated with too little circumspection by the Christian Fathers.

'It is, then, to be understood, that the ancient Jews were persuaded, that there were in the holy scriptures hidden and deep senses, which might be discovered by means of the expressions employed by the Holy Spirit, because these expressions were too strong to be restricted to the subject which the prophets appear to have in view. Proceeding by this rule, the divine author of this epistle has discovered various truths of the gospel in the Old Testament. One may turn for example to the remarks which he has made in chapter ii. upon the words of Psalm viii.; in chapter iv. upon those of Psalm xcv.; and in chapter xii. upon those of the prophet Haggai.

'Another principle of the ancient Jews was, that the person and kingdom of the Messiah were designed, not only in those

* Tom. II. p. 428.

prophecies which regarded him directly, but in other obscurer oracles which had no direct relation to him. They further believed, that the great personages of the Old Testament were figures of this divine king, whom the nation was expecting, and that what the scripture said in honor of them, was applicable to them only in an imperfect sense, while it was applicable to the Messiah in its whole extent. In this, the fundamental principle of the Jewish doctors corresponded to the intention of the Holy Spirit. All the prophets spoke of Christ, of his sufferings, and his glory; and all which God said in honor of David and Solomon belonged less to them than to the celestial king of whom they were the figures. Conformably to this principle, the sacred author explains of Jesus Christ, what the Holy Spirit had said of these two kings. Comp. ch. i. 5. 8, 9, 10, with Ps. ii. 5. 2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. xlv. 7.'

It will be readily perceived, that we quote Beausobre only in evidence of the fact, that the mode of interpretation which is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, prevailed among the ancient Jews. His notion that there is sufficient foundation for it in the real existence of mystical senses throughout the Old Testament, will, to many readers, unacquainted with his works, hardly give a fair impression of the character of one of the most learned and acute of writers.

Such and so prevalent was the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament among the Jews. We will now attend to some examples of it furnished by the writer to the Hebrews, noticing by the way, a few other passages which illustrate his manner of reasoning.

The Jews gloried in their Law as having been given by the ministry of angels. In the first chapter, therefore, the writer undertakes to prove Christ's superiority to the angels. He asks, vv. 5, 6;—'For to which of the angels did God ever say, *Thou art my son, this day have I made thee so?* and again; *I will be to him as a father; and he shall be to me as a son?* And in another place, upon introducing his firstborn into the world, it is said; *And let all the angels of God do him reverence.*'

The first passage here quoted by the writer to the Hebrews, is taken from the second Psalm, v. 7, which the ancient Jews considered prophetic of the Messiah, as many Christians have done. The next is from 2 Samuel vii. 14, where it is said of Solomon, and cannot be regarded as having any reference to the Messiah or Christ, except in a secondary and mystical sense, Christ being viewed as the antitype of Solomon. The third

passage is, probably, one which by some accident has been added to the Septuagint version, there being nothing in the original properly corresponding to it. It is found in that version, Deut. xxxii. 43. According to the Septuagint, the first part of this verse is thus read; 'Rejoice, ye heavens, with him, and do him reverence, all ye sons of God; rejoice, ye nations, with his people, and strengthen them, all ye angels of God; for he avenges and will avenge the blood of his sons.' However the writer to the Hebrews may have understood the primary meaning of the clause which he quotes, it is clear that he could have applied it to Christ only in a secondary sense. Many, however, have supposed that the words quoted by him, are not taken from the Septuagint version of Deuteronomy, but of Psalm xcvii. 7, where the rendering of the common version is, 'Worship him, all ye Gods.' But the proper meaning of these words has as little reference to the Messiah as that of those before referred to. It is Jehovah, not the Messiah, whom the angels are exhorted to reverence (if angels be meant, as the Septuagint translator supposed); and nothing is there found respecting God's introducing his first born into the world.

Immediately after the passages quoted, we find another long one applied to Jesus as the Messiah, vv. 8, 9; 'But of the Son it is said, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*,' &c. It is taken from the fortyfifth Psalm. This Psalm is apparently an epithalamium on the marriage of some prince, perhaps Solomon; but was explained by the Jews allegorically of the Messiah.

But in proving the rank of Christ to be superior to that of the angels, according to the writer's conceptions of such superiority, his ignominious death, his death as a malefactor, presented a great difficulty. With the purpose which the writer had in view throughout the Epistle, the death of Christ was a topic of great delicacy, to be managed with peculiar address; and he has, in the different ways in which he has presented it to view, shown himself equal to the task. It may be observed incidentally that, in his treatment of this topic, he discovers a very different state of mind from that of St Paul, who brings it forward with the most unreserved boldness, and the feeling of one who regarded it only in its incomparable moral grandeur, and in the immeasurable benefits to man, connected with it. The apostle looked with unconcern upon its circumstances of worldly ignominy, upon 'the scandal of the cross.' It was for him, and not the writer to the Hebrews, to exclaim; 'God forbid that I should glory except in the CROSS of Christ.' In the second chapter, the author of the Epistle thus introduces the subject,

vv. 6—10 ;—' Now one hath somewhere borne testimony, saying, *What is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou regardest him? Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels; Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor; Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.* Now in declaring all things to be subject to him, he has left nothing which is not subject to him. But we do not as yet see all things subject to him. But we see Jesus crowned with glory and honor, who in suffering death was made a little lower than the angels; to the end that through the favor of God, he might taste death for every one. For it was proper that He for whom are all things and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, should perfect the leader of their salvation through sufferings.'

The words quoted from the eighth Psalm, were considered by the writer as applicable to man universally in their primary sense. But so applied, they could not be understood in the extent of their meaning. All things are not as yet subject to man. This circumstance, he, probably, considered as in itself suggesting a higher sense, and a special application. According to him, they are to be understood allegorically of Christ. In suffering death, he was indeed made a little lower than the angels; but in this respect only; and in compensation for this, he was, in the highest sense of the terms, crowned with glory and honor. The writer then proceeds to speak immediately of the propriety and benefit of his sufferings; and of his having the same nature as those whom he came to save. After the words last quoted he proceeds;—' For he who sanctifies, and they who are sanctified, are all of one race; for which cause, he is not ashamed to call them brethren; saying, *I will announce thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the congregation, I will sing praises to thee.* And again, *I will put my trust in him;* and again, *Behold I and the children whom God hath given me.* Since then the children have flesh and blood in common, so also in like manner had he, that by dying, he might destroy the power of him who is the prince of death, that is, the Devil,* and deliver those who through fear of death were all their lifetime in bondage.'

The three quotations introduced in this passage, and put into the mouth of Christ, are all interpreted allegorically. The first is from the twentysecond Psalm, v. 22, which the Jews considered as relating primarily to David, but in its higher sense to the Messiah. The last two are from Isaiah viii. 17, 18, where

* According to a Jewish conception, Sammaël, the angel of death, was identified with Satan.

they stand in immediate connexion, and where the prophet is speaking of himself and his children. The object of the first of these two, namely, *I will put my trust in him*, as used by the writer to the Hebrews, is, probably, to ascribe words to Christ, containing an expression of dependance on God, suitable to his nature as a man. The object of the quotations, generally, is to show that Christ had the same nature with other men, his *brethren*, and especially with those, who, as his followers, may be denominated his *children;* both terms implying a community of species.

In the first six verses of the third chapter, the writer asserts the superiority of Christ to Moses.—'Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the invitation from Heaven, fix your thoughts upon the apostle and high priest of our profession, Jesus; who was faithful to him who appointed him, as Moses was in the whole household of *God*. For he was esteemed worthy of as much greater honor than Moses, as he who orders a household has greater honor than its members.* For every household is ordered by some one; but he who orders all things is God. And Moses, indeed, was faithful in the whole household as a minister, to testify what was to be commanded; but Christ as a son over God's household, whose household we are; if we hold fast our confident and glorious hope to the end.'

Christ was superior to Moses. But in Numbers, xii. 7, it is declared of Moses, that he was 'faithful in the whole household of God.' The writer of the Epistle refines upon the use of the particle, *in*. Moses, according to him, was faithful *in* the whole household; that is, a member of the household, a minister, a steward; but Christ, as a son, was faithful *over* the whole household. For the stress which is laid on the word *in*, there is no foundation in the original, the meaning of which is, that Moses was faithful in all that concerned the family or people of God. Christ, the author says, orders the whole household of God; for this, like every human family, must have a particular master, all things being, at the same time, under the government of God. This we conceive to be his meaning; but it is clear that the analogy between the family of God, and a human family, is not of such a nature as to afford a foundation for the inference which is made.

The passage extending from the seventh verse of the third to the eleventh of the fourth chapter, is perhaps more strikingly mystical and obscure, than any to which we have adverted. The writer teaches that the Jews did not enter into the rest prepared

* Literally, *than the household*, that is, than all or any one of its members.

by God; and that it still remains to be entered. This rest, indeed, in its literal and inferior sense, denoted the promised land, from which those Jews only were excluded who perished in the wilderness, through their want of trust in God. These the writer proposes as a warning to Christians. In reference to what he regarded as the primary sense of the passage quoted by him, Psalm xcv. 7–11, he thus expresses himself; iii. 15–19;—'When it is said, *Today, now that ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the place of provocation*—who were they who having heard his voice, provoked God? Were they not all who came out from Egypt under Moses? And with whom was he offended for forty years? Was it not with those sinners, whose bodies fell in the wilderness? And to whom did he swear that they should not enter his rest, but to those who wanted faith? So then we see that they could not enter it on account of their want of faith.'

Here the rest spoken of, is the promised land. This was the Jewish rest. But the christian rest is far more glorious. The term as used by the Psalmist, the writer regards as having a mystical sense, in which, in reference to Christians, it denotes rest in heaven. He proceeds, ch. iv. 1–9;—'Let us then, to whom a promise still remains of entering into his rest, fear lest any one of you fall short of it. For we have received glad news as they did. But what they heard did not profit them; not being conjoined with faith, in the minds of the hearers. We who have faith are entering the rest (as it is said, *So I swear in my wrath* THEY *shall not enter my rest)*, that is to say,* the rest which followed the completion of his works at the foundation of the world. For it is somewhere said of the seventh day, *And God rested on the seventh day from all his works;* and again, it is here said, *They shall not enter my rest.* Since then it still remains for some to enter it, and they who first received the glad news did not enter through want of faith, God again fixes a day, *today*, saying by David so long a time after, what has been alleged, *Today, now that ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts.* For if Joshua had brought them into the rest, there would after this have been no mention of another day. So then there still remains a sabbath rest for the people of God.'

The object of the quotation from Genesis, in the fourth verse, compared with the words of the Psalm on which the writer is

* Καίτοι. For the sense given to this particle, see Hoogeveen Doctrina Particularum a Schütz. p. 317 et seqq. and Carpzov and Kypke upon the verse. The following is the rendering of Beausobre; *Or le repos dont je parle, c'est celui dont Dieu se reposa, lorsque tous ses ouvrages furent achevés, après la fondation du monde.*

commenting, is to show that the term *rest*, may have the higher meaning which he assigns it. The reasoning which follows upon the use of the term *today*, is to prove that it has that meaning in the passage commented on by him.

In the next chapter, the fifth, the writer enters upon his purpose of proving that Christ is a high priest, far more exalted and glorious than the Jewish priests. He is a priest by the special appointment of God, after the fashion of Melchisedec, of whom he is the antitype. The passage respecting Melchisedec is from Psalm cx. 4. The conception respecting his being a type of the Messiah, seems to have been peculiar to the writer to the Hebrews, as there is no sufficient evidence that he was so represented by the ancient Jews.

We shall not go through the dissertation respecting him, in order to point out the instances of reasoning similar to those already produced. But there is one passage, by which, we suppose, that most readers have been perplexed, because it seems complete in itself, the language appears plain, and the obvious meaning is, at the same time, so paradoxical. It may therefore be worth while to explain it.

In the beginning of the seventh chapter, the writer says; vv. 1–8;—'For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him, to whom also Abraham gave a tenth share of his spoils, the interpretation of whose name is, first, King of Righteousness, and then, King of Salem, that is, King of Peace; being without father, without mother, without pedigree, the days of his priesthood having no beginning, and his life no end; being made like the Son of God, continues a priest forever.'

This language is figurative. The literal meaning of it is, that there is no account in the Old Testament of the father, mother, or pedigree of Melchisedec; he did not, like the Jewish priests, receive his office on the ground of his descent from a particular family; there is no account of any period when he entered upon it, and no account of his death, when he ceased to be a priest. But the absence of any mention of these particulars, the writer to the Hebrews considers as symbolical, and serving to qualify Melchisedec, as he appears in the Old Testament, to be eminently a type of Christ. It is to this conception that the mystical character of his language is conformed. Like Melchisedec, Christ did not derive his title to the priesthood from descent; there was no well known period at which he assumed it; and he did not lose it by death; on the contrary he

continues a priest forever. 'The Jewish priests,' the writer says, a little after, 'are many, because they are prevented from continuing in office by death; but Christ, because he continues to live forever, has a priesthood which does not pass from him to a successor.' vv. 23, 24.

In chapter vii. 9, 10, the following passage occurs. The object of the writer is to prove that Melchisedec, and consequently Christ, whom he regards as his antitype, was a priest superior to the Levitical priests.—'And, so to say, Levi also, who receives tythes, paid a tythe [to Melchisedec] through Abraham; for he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him.'—'Just,' says an Orthodox commentator, 'as all mankind were in the loins of Adam, when he sinned and fell, and so they sinned and fell with him.' This notion is common in Calvinistic writers. We do not find in St Paul such reasoning as that of the writer to the Hebrews.

The bearing of the next quotation from the Old Testament which we shall notice, is probably not apprehended by a great majority of readers. It relates to an opinion formerly prevalent among the Jews, but which has now become obsolete, and is almost forgotten. Ch. viii. 1–6;—'Now the sum of what has been said is this; we have such a high priest, who sits at the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the most holy place, and of the true tabernacle which God erected, not man. Now every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices; whence of necessity this high priest must have an offering to make.

'But if he were on earth he would not be a priest; there being priests already to offer gifts conformably to the Law, who serve in that temple,* which is but a copy and shadow of things in heaven;—according to the divine direction to Moses, for it is said, *See that thou make all things according to the pattern shown thee in the mount.*'†

It was a fancy of the Jews, that there was a temple in heaven corresponding to their temple on earth; the latter being modelled after the fashion of the former. Thus the author of the Book of Wisdom, ix. 8, represents Solomon as saying;—'Thou didst command me to erect a temple upon thy holy mountain, and an altar in the city where thou dwellest, *an imitation of that before prepared by thee from the beginning.*' In

* The word *temple*, here inserted, is required by the connexion. So Beausobre; *Qui font le service dans un sanctuare, qui est le représentation et l'ómbre de celui du Ciel.*

† Exodus xxv. 40. xxvi. 30. xxvii. 8.

the Rabbinical books, this opinion is frequently mentioned or implied. It is repeatedly asserted, that the 'temple below was fashioned after the form of the temple on high.'* In the Talmud, there is among others, the following passage;—'Rabbi Joseph, the son of Rabbi Jehoida said; "An ark, a table, and a candlestick, all of fire, descended from heaven, and Moses saw them and formed others after their fashion; according to what is said Exodus, xxv. 40; *See and make after the pattern of those which thou hast seen in the mount.*"'†

It is on this opinion that the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews is founded. The writer quotes Exodus, after the manner in which we find it quoted in the Talmud, in proof of its truth; not, indeed, giving the passage a properly allegorical sense, but connecting with it a traditionary and Cabbalistic explanation. The notion of a temple in heaven, where Christ ministers, corresponding to the Jewish temple on earth, appears repeatedly in the following part of the Epistle; as in ch. ix. 11, 12;—'But Christ, when he came, being the high priest of those good things which were to come, entered once for all into the most holy place, through that greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation, offering not the blood of goats and calves, but his own blood, having found the means of an eternal deliverance.' So likewise, v. 24;—'For Christ has not entered into the most holy place made with hands, the copy of the true, but into heaven itself, so as now to appear before God in our behalf.'

We pass to another passage. The writer, in contrasting the death of Christ, which he figuratively represents as a sacrifice, with the Jewish sacrifices, says, ch. x. 4–9;—'For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to remove sin. Wherefore upon his [Christ's] coming into the world, he says; *Sacrifice and oblation thou hast not desired; a body hast thou prepared for me; with holocausts and sin offerings thou art not pleased;* then he said, *Behold I come (in the volume of the book it is written concerning me) to do thy will, O God.* After saying, *Sacrifice and oblation and holocausts and sin offerings, thou hast not desired, neither art pleased with* (which are offered in conformity to the law), then he has, *Lo I come to do thy will.* He sets aside the former to establish the value of

* Schoettgenii Horæ Hebraicæ, I. 1213.

† Ibid. p. 1207. On the opinion of the Jews above referred to, consult the whole of the tract of Schoettgen which has been quoted, entitled 'De Hierosolyma Cœlesti,' and especially the second chapter, 'De Templo Hierosolymæ Cœlestis.'

the latter. By which will, we have become holy, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.'

The passage quoted is from the Septuagint Version of the fortieth Psalm. In this version the clause, *A body thou hast prepared for me,* is wholly different in sense from the corresponding clause in the original, which is rendered in the Common Version, *Mine ears thou hast opened.* The meaning of the original probably is, 'Thou hast opened mine ears to hear and understand thy will.'

The words which David used in speaking of himself, are here put into the mouth of Christ. In another writer this might be supposed to be done by way of application, in order to express his own conception of the office of Christ in the supposed words of the Psalmist. As used by the writer to the Hebrews, it seems most probable, that he understood them in a mystical sense.

The subject is far from being exhausted; but it is unnecessary to adduce more examples. Those which have been observed upon, are sufficient to explain and confirm what has been stated respecting the allegorical expositions of the author of the Epistle.

Allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, similar to those on which the reasoning in the Epistle to the Hebrews is founded, occur, likewise, in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles. They are found in a speech of St Paul, as it is given by St Luke, in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts. This speech was delivered a considerable time before the composition of the earliest of his epistles, which was, probably, that to the Galatians. In his epistles, he differs widely, as it is our purpose to show, from the writer to the Hebrews, in his style of reasoning, and in the use made by him of passages from the Old Testament.

In order to understand this subject, it is necessary to attend to the fact, that there are various modes of using the words of the Old Testament, which are not to be confounded with the mystical exposition of it. Perhaps, however, some of them are more likely to occur where there is a general opinion that its language admits of different senses and applications, than where no such opinion exists. The Old Testament was, to almost all the learned among the Jews, the main, ultimate object of their studies, and constituted for the common people the whole of their literature. The Jews, generally, were very familiar with its contents, to the exclusion of almost all intellec-

tual acquirements, not immediately connected with its study. The contents of the Old Testament being thus fixed in the mind of a Jew, would be frequently brought to his recollection. For him, its books were a storehouse of examples, illustrations, maxims, striking sayings, analogies, correspondences, and quotations. A remarkable event would bring to his mind a similar event related in the Old Testament. The general truths, and the laws of duty, there enforced, either in abstract terms, or by particular precepts or remarks bearing upon some special case, would be suggested to him by those circumstances to which they were applicable. A striking saying used upon one occasion would be applied to another of a similar kind; and when a Jewish writer was desirous of expressing his thoughts with more effect than he could do in his own language, the only words which would occur to him for the purpose of quotation, would be those of the Old Testament.

Without proper attention and judgment on our part, a writer, in some of these frequent uses of the Old Testament, may be suspected of giving its words a mystical meaning, when he does not. The two classes of citations, those alleged in a proper sense, and those in an allegoricaal sense, are, however, for the most part, easily distinguishable. When a doubt arrises, there is no mechanical rule by which it can be determined. As in every other case of ambiguity in language, it can be solved only by a consideration of all those circumstances which may enable us to form a judgment respecting the intention of the writer.

The words, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν, rendered in the Common Version, '*that it might be fulfilled which was spoken*,' and other forms equivalent in sense, in which the verb πληροῦν, rendered, *to fulfil*, is used, occur frequently in the Gospels, as introductory to quotations from the Old Testament. None of them are found in St Paul's epistles. There has been much controversy respecting their meaning; and it is a question which it is important to settle. It is clear that they are often used to introduce what the writer considered as a prophecy; but their use, as may be made evident, is not confined to this purpose.

The verb in question denotes in its primary senses, *to fill up, to complete, to make perfect*. In a secondary sense, it is applied to a prophecy which is supposed to be accomplished. The event is considered as the counterpart of the prophecy; and by its occurrence, the prophecy, which before was regarded as imperfect, existing without its *completion*, is conceived of as *completed*. But, in a similar manner, it may be applied to a law, which is fulfilled by its performance or execution;—to a maxim

when an exemplification of it is pointed out;—to a striking saying originally used on some particular occasion, when another occasion occurs to which it is equally suitable;—and to a declaration or proposition, viewed in reference to the facts by which its truth is shown. Accordingly, the common rendering by the term, *fulfil*, fails, in some cases, of giving the proper sense. A verbal rendering from an ancient into a modern language, must often misrepresent the meaning of the original. The terms, *corresponding to*, *conformably to*, or others equivalent, may sometimes be used with propriety in rendering the formulas under consideration; as for instance in St James, ii. 22, 23, where he is speaking of Abraham;—'Thou seest how his faith operated together with his works, and by his works was his faith perfected; conformably to the scripture which says, *Abraham had faith in God, and it was esteemed righteousness in him, and he was called the friend of God.*'

The words quoted are not a prophecy, but a declaration; the statement of an historical fact. This passage, therefore, is alone sufficient to show that the phrase used in the original, ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή, *the scripture was fulfilled*, may be employed when the writer has no thought of the accomplishment of a prophecy.

Thus too, in his last discourse, our Saviour, in referring to Judas, John xiii. 18, quotes the words of Psalm xli. 9;—'I speak not of you all. I know whom I have chosen; nay, answering to what is said in scripture, (*or*, as is said in scripture,) *He who eats bread with me has lifted up his heel against me.*'

Here, our Saviour applies to his own situation a striking passage uttered by David respecting himself.*

The words rendered, *that the scripture might be fulfilled*, as used by our Saviour in another place, respecting the perdition of Judas, may require some explanation. In the prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, he says, v. 12;—'I guarded those whom thou hast given me, and no one of them is lost, except the child of perdition, that the scripture might be accomplished.'

The meaning is, that the treachery of Judas was a means by which the purposes of God, as revealed in the scriptures, were to be accomplished. The object of our Saviour was to impress the minds of his apostles with the truth, that his approaching suf-

* Surenhusius, in his Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς, gives examples of two forms of quotation from the Rabbinical books, both of which appear to be equivalent to those which are observed upon above. See pp. 2–5, and p. 197. The remarks made above are confirmed by the examples adduced by Surenhusius, and partly founded upon them. His judgment is of no value, but the examples of Rabbinical quotation which his learning has enabled him to collect, may be of use.

ferings and death were not the result of any unexpected event, nor of the power of his enemies triumphing over him; but that they were necessary to the accomplishment of that great plan for the moral renovation of mankind, which had been partially unfolded in the Old Testament. They had been anticipated and voluntarily submitted to by himself. The crime of Judas was one link in that train of causes which led to that consummation.

There are two other passages which are to be explained in a somewhat similar manner. In our Saviour's conversation with his two disciples, on the way to Emmaus, after his resurrection, Luke represents him as saying, ch. xxiv. 25–27;—'O unwise and slow to believe all that the prophets have spoken; was it not necessary that the Messiah should thus suffer before entering into his glory? Then beginning with Moses and going on through the Prophets, he explained to them what related to himself in all the scriptures.'

Afterwards, Luke thus describes one of Christ's last conversations with his disciples, ch. xxiv. 44–48;—'And he said to them, This is what I told you while I was yet with you, that it was necessary that all which is written concerning me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, should be accomplished. Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures; and he said to them, Thus it is written; and conformably to this, it was necessary that the Messiah should suffer and rise from the dead on the third day; and in his name, reformation and the forgiveness of sins must be proclaimed to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And do you bear testimony to these things.'

What our Saviour probably did in both these discourses, was, to point out the consistency between the character and purposes of God, as revealed in the Old Testament, and the circumstances attending his mission, and the character of his religion. His disciples had regarded the Jewish dispensation as introductory to a better, the temporal kingdom of the Messiah. He opened their minds to enlarged views of it, and taught them, that, conformably to a right understanding of its purpose, it was a spiritual, and not a temporal kingdom, for which it was intended to prepare. He showed them from Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, in what the true happiness of man had been always, by their holiest and most enlightened teachers, represented as consisting, and the suitableness of everything in Christianity to enable man to attain this happiness. He explained to them that his death and resurrection, however foreign from all

the notions which they had formerly entertained respecting the Messiah, were necessary parts of that glorious plan of providence so long ago commenced, which he came to accomplish. He illustrated the connexion between the Jewish and Christian dispensations. He pointed out some of the most striking passages of the Jewish scriptures which related to himself; that is, which related to Christianity, as serving to show that the same design was apparent in both dispensations. He was not employed in expounding prophecies respecting himself personally.*

We pass to another topic. Passages from the Prophets descriptive of the indocility, obstinacy, and vices of the Jews, are quoted both by our Saviour and St Paul, as applicable to the Jews of their time. In this, there is in general no difficulty. But in one passage of the discourses of our Saviour, the rendering of the Common Version, according to the present use of language, is incorrect. In Matthew, xv. 7,8, the words of that Version are ;—'Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.'

By Isaiah's prophesying thus, is meant that he so spoke under a divine impulse. This is conformable to the use of the word, *prophesy*, at the time when the Version was made.

Our Saviour in one instance assumes an allegorical interpretation as true. In one instance, likewise, St Paul, Galatians, iv. 21–31, gives an exposition of a passage conformed to the mode of allegorical interpretation. In both cases the object was to convict their opponents of error, even upon their own principles. The passage of St Paul will be explained hereafter. The words of Christ referred to, may be found, Matthew, xxii. 41–45;

* Grotius believed in a mystical, secondary sense of the Jewish prophecies. In this sense only does he explain concerning Christ most of those which have been supposed to relate to him. He finds no literal prophecy of him in Isaiah; and according to Le Clerc, there are only five passages in all the Old Testament, which he explains as having a primary reference to him. These are Genesis, xlix. 10. Ps. cx. Daniel ix. 24, seqq. Haggai, ii. 7, 8. Malachi, iii. 1, seqq. Le Clerc defends his method of interpretation. (*Bibliotheque Choisie*, XXVII, 388, seqq.)

Considering that Grotius held these opinions, the following passages from his *Votum pro Pace Ecclesiastica*, (Opp. iv. 674.) are striking, and deserve attention. He says; 'The mystical sense confirms believers, but does not convince the incredulous, except where the parties are agreed about the mystical sense.' He observes that in controversy with the Jews, he has never urged the supposed prophecy that the Messiah was to be born of a virgin. 'In the first place,' he remarks, 'we must prove to them, that Jesus was the Messiah from his miracles, his resurrection, and the predicted calling of the Gentiles; and then they will readily believe his mother respecting her virginity.'

The subject of the character and interpretation of the Jewish prophecies is one which requires a very different exposition from what it has received. There is no satisfactory work on these topics.

—'The Pharisees being together, Jesus asked them, What think ye of the Messiah, whose son is he? They say to him, The son of David. He says to them, How then doth David, under a divine impulse, call him Lord; saying, *Jehovah said to my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, till I put thine enemies under thy feet?* If then David call him Lord, how is he his son? And no one could answer him.'

The Pharisees had low and very erroneous notions of their expected Messiah. They conceived of him as a temporal prince, at the summit of worldly grandeur. They regarded the title of Son of David as honorable to him; meaning to express by it, not only that he was to be a descendant of David, but that in his power, in the splendor of his reign, in his deliverance of the Jews from their enemies, and in his exalting them to be a great nation, he was to resemble, however he might excel, his predecessor. These were the common notions of the Jews; and of these, the Pharisees, the enemies of Christ, without doubt, took advantage. Appealing to the character of Jesus, to the professed objects of his ministry, and to all the circumstances of his condition, they asked the common people, Whether this man could be the Son of David? Of the nature of the office which God had conferred upon him, of that connexion with the Almighty, which opened to him the treasuries of wisdom and power, of his moral elevation,—of all that gave him an immeasurable superiority over David, as well as over every other individual, they had no conception nor feeling. In opposition to these low notions of the Messiah, which they abused for the purpose of justifying themselves and their followers in their rejection of Christ, he, in the passage which has been quoted, opposes their own application of the words of David, as they supposed them to be, to the Messiah. The purpose of his question may be thus expressed; 'You object to me that I do not come as the Son of David, according to your notions of that title; but you, at the same time, believe that David regarded the Messiah as far superior to himself. Your notions of the Messiah are too mean when you imagine him to be the Son of David. How do you reconcile them with the opinion, that David, under a divine impulse, called him Lord? The Messiah is indeed far superior to him; a greater than David is here.' By the question of Christ, the minds of some of those who heard it, might be led to reflection on the subject, and opened to more enlarged conceptions of the character of the Messiah. The words of David, it is likewise to be observed, though not originally spoken of Christ, were applicable to him, without conveying any error respecting his character.

We have assumed throughout these remarks, that there is no foundation for the opinion of the existence of mystical senses in the Old Testament. But to this it may be objected, that their existence is implied in the quotations of Christ. We have, therefore, given some explanation of those which may seem, in this point of view, to present the most difficulty; and neither in these, nor in the few which remain, do we find any ground for the objection. But if the case were less clear, we must recollect that the words of Christ were reported from memory by the evangelists, and not always with perfect accuracy. This is evident from the fact, that in recording the same discourse or saying, the first three evangelists differ from each other, not unfrequently as to the words themselves, and occasionally also as to their sense and bearing. Now all the evangelists, being themselves allegorists, it would not have been strange, if unconsciously, and through inadvertence, they had given an allegorical turn, by a slight change of expression, to words which were used by our Saviour himself only by way of application.

In the twentyfourth chapter of his Gospel, vv. 15–16, St Matthew represents Christ as saying;—'When, therefore, ye shall see the desolating abomination, as is said by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (let him that readeth understand),* then let those who are in Judea fly to the mountains.'

We doubt much whether the passages in Daniel here referred to, ix. 27. xii. 11, have any relation to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. But upon the supposition that they have not, the words of our Saviour may be easily explained. They are not a reference to a prophecy, but the application of a striking expression. But how little we could, in any case, insist upon the precise words found in Matthew, may appear from the manner in which the same portion of our Saviour's discourse is recorded by Luke, xxi. 20,21;—'But when ye shall see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation is near. Then let those who are in Judea fly to the mountains.'

The remarks which have been made, seemed necessary to a clear understanding of the subject. Our next purpose is to show, that there are no examples of allegorical interpretation in the epistles of St Paul, except one, Galatians, iv. 21–v. 1., which is introduced as an *argumentum ad hominem*. We shall observe upon those passages which have been supposed to favor a contrary supposition, proceeding through the epistles in the order, in which we believe them to have been written.

* The words in the parenthesis are words of the evangelist.

In Galatians, iii. 15, 16, the apostle says;—'Brethren, I speak familiarly; no one sets aside even a human covenant, or makes additions to it, after it has been ratified. But the promises were made to Abraham and to his offspring. The scripture does not say to offsprings, as speaking of many, but to thy offspring, as speaking of one, which is Christ.'

Which is Christ.—The name Christ has here been understood by many expositors, as denoting Christ personally. That Christ himself was intended, has been thought to appear from St Paul's reasoning upon the use of the word, *offspring*, in the singular number.

But neither the Hebrew, nor the Greek word, corresponding to *offspring*, any more than the English word, is ever used in the plural number to denote the descendants of an individual. In this sense, they, like *offspring*, are collective nouns, found only in the singular number. As the passage from the Old Testament stands in the original, it evidently relates, not to any particular descendant of Abraham, but to the offspring of Abraham, generally; the word *offspring* being taken either in a literal or figurative sense. It would seem to follow, therefore, that St Paul's reasoning is Cabbalistic and allegorical.

The first answer to this, is, that the word *Christ* does not denote Christ personally. It is used to denote Christians; as the word *Israel* is often used by the apostle to denote Israelites;* and as Christians are afterwards called, in this epistle, vi. 16, in a still more figurative use of the term, *the Israel of God*. Thus, likewise, we find in another passage, 1 Cor. xii. 12, the whole body of Christians denominated by the name of Christ; and the figure by which they are represented as his body, repeatedly occurs in the writings of the apostle.

That Christians, not Christ, are intended in the passage before us, appears from its connexion. In what precedes, the apostle teaches the Galatians, that *those who are of the faith*, that is, Christians, not those who are under the Law, that is, Jews, *are the sons of Abraham*,† the offspring intended by the promise; that it is they alone who are *blessed with Abraham, who had faith*, while *those who stand up for the observance of the Law*, in opposition to Christianity, *are under a curse*,‡ and that *the blessing of Abraham has, through Jesus Christ, been conferred on the Gentiles*. § And in what follows, using the same expression as in the passage under consideration, he says;—*If ye*

* Rom. ix. 6, 31; x. 19, 21; xi. 2, 7, 25, 26. 1 Cor. x. 18. Ephes. ii. 12.
† Ch. iii. 7. ‡ Ib. vv. 9, 10. § Ib. v. 14.

*belong to Christ, then are ye the offspring of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise.** By all this, he shows, that it is Christians, not Christ, whom he denominates *the offspring of Abraham.* No promise, indeed, could be supposed to have been made to Christ, individually, through Abraham.

The remark of the apostle upon the use of the word *offspring*, in the singular, is next to be explained. The Jewish teachers among the Galatians taught them, that the blessings promised to the offspring of Abraham were to be enjoyed only by Jews, the natural offspring of Abraham, observing the Jewish Law; and by proselytes to Judaism, who thus became incorporated with the Jewish nation, and entitled to share in its blessings. The apostle, on the contrary, taught, that the true offspring of Abraham were those who resembled him in faith, or trust in God. The Jews believed themselves to have a claim upon God, in consequence of their descent from Abraham, and their observance of the Law which God had given them. The apostle taught, that the favor of God was to be obtained through faith, as a follower of Christ. But with such opposite views of true religion, either those who were of the faith, or those who rested upon the Law, could not be the true offspring, intended by the promise. It was impossible that both should be meant, that two such different classes of men should be signified by the same term. It is with this view of the subject, that St Paul observes, that *the scripture does not say to offsprings.* It is his purpose to imply, that this strange use of language would be required to answer to the supposition, that both Jews and Christians, both the natural descendants, and the spiritual children of Abraham, were intended by the promise. No, the promise was made to Christ, not Israel; to Christians, not Jews. This he proceeds to confirm in what follows.

The next passage has usually been considered as affording clearer proof than any other, that St Paul, in his epistles, has ascribed a mystical meaning to the words of the Old Testament.—Galatians, iv. 21–v. 1;—'Tell me, you who wish to be under the Law, do you not attend to what is in the Book of the Law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, one by a bondwoman, and the other by a free woman. The son of the bondwoman was a child of the flesh; but the son of the free woman was born in consequence of the promise;—which is an allegory; for these women are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, producing children who are in servi-

* Ib. v. 29.

tude, which is Hagar; for this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to the Jerusalem now existing, which is in servitude with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and this is our mother. For it is written, *Rejoice thou barren who hast not borne; break forth into cries of joy, thou who hast not been in travail; for the children of the desolate will be more numerous than hers who has a husband.* Now we, brethren, like Isaac, are children of the promise. But as then the child of the flesh persecuted him who was born by the power of God, so it is now. But what says the scripture; *Cast out the bondwoman with her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not inherit with the son of the free.* Brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free. Stand firm in the liberty with which Christ has made you free, and be not again brought under the yoke of bondage.'

Respecting this passage, the question to be decided is, whether St Paul did or did not regard the narrative in the Old Testament as originally designed to be, in a mystical sense, prophetical or typical of the state of Jews and Christians. We believe he did not.

The Jewish teachers who had come among the Galatians, taught them, as has been said, that the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom were confined to Jews by birth, or to proselytes. According to them, it was necessary for the Gentile Galatians, in order to enjoy those blessings, to join themselves to the Jews, submitting to all the rites of the Law. In maintaining this doctrine, their reasoning must have been founded upon the Old Testament; and in arguing from it, they interpreted it, as we may reasonably suppose, after the fashion of their age and nation, allegorically. But their arguments, as is evident from the epistle, had had much effect upon the minds of many of the Galatians. Such being the state of things, the object of the apostle in the passage before us, was in part, to show the futility of arguments founded upon allegorical interpretations, by giving a striking example of the manner, in which a sense wholly opposite to the purpose of those Jewish teachers, might, according to their mode of interpretation, be assigned to the scriptures. If this view of the passage be correct, it is a specimen of reasoning upon the principles of an opponent, in a case where such reasoning is perfectly allowable. The argument is an *argumentum ad hominem.* That the Jewish teachers would reason in the manner supposed, is in itself highly probable; and if they did so, we should expect the apostle to take at least as much notice of it, as we believe him to have done in the passage before us.

If it were his purpose to advert to it, no mode of doing so, as far as appears, could have been more proper, than that which the preceding remarks represent him as having adopted. With this conception of the passage, the words with which it commences, must be understood as having in them something of irony; 'Tell me, ye who wish to be under the Law, do you not attend to what is in the Book of the Law?'

It must be observed, that the secondary sense which St Paul gives to the narrative, could not, from its nature, have rested upon any traditionary authority in the Jewish schools. He himself brings no arguments to establish it; nor does he use it as the foundation of any argument. He does not attempt to prove it, nor to prove anything by it. The truth of those facts to which he represents the narrative as corresponding, is equally assumed as the truth of the narrative itself. Now supposing the truth of a fact or a doctrine to be granted, an allegorical expositor may fancy that he discovers a mystical sense, expressive of it, in certain words of the Old Testament; and may thus explain them to readers whom he regards as agreeing with him in belief. Such an exposition may even serve to confirm their faith. But in earnest controversy, a supposed mystical sense, unsupported by traditionary authority, or by a show of reasoning, would be wholly out of place. It would be used as a direct argument, if at all, only by one who had been accustomed to indulge in the very extravagance of allegorical exposition. What, for instance, would be thought of a Jewish Rabbi, who undertook, in controversy with a Christian, to prove the falsehood of our religion by mystical interpretations of the Old Testament? Now St Paul was writing in earnest controversy; he was a man of strong good sense; and it cannot be pretended that he was an extravagant allegorist. Such being the case, it does not seem reasonable to imagine, that the apostle, understanding the narrative which he quoted in a mystical sense, adduced the correspondence between this sense and certain facts which he asserts, as an argument for the truth of those facts. The circumstances which were the immediate occasion of his allegorizing the narrative, seem to be much better explained by the supposition before stated.

It is not to be thought, however, that the purpose which has been mentioned, was the sole purpose of the apostle. The narrative in his hands becomes a striking parable, if we may so speak, by which he expresses the truth of the bondage of the Jews, and the freedom of Christians; by which he teaches, not proves, the superior dignity and privileges of the latter, and en-

forces the doctrine, that they, not the Jews, are the offspring of Abraham, to whom the promise to the patriarch had respect.

There are no quotations from the Old Testament in the two epistles to the Thessalonians.

In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, St Paul, in affirming the right of the apostles to be supported by their converts, asks, ch. ix. 8–10;—'Is what I say founded only on the common notions of men? Does not the Law also say the same? For it is written in the Law of Moses, *Thou shalt not muzzle an ox, whilst treading out grain.* Does God care for the oxen alone? Or does he, in its full purpose, say this for our sakes? For our sakes, indeed, was it written; for he who ploughs and he who threshes, ought to do so in the hope of sharing the grain.'

There is no reason for understanding the apostle as affirming that the direction which he quotes has a mystical sense, and was intended in this sense to apply to the apostles. His meaning is, that the principle involved in the direction, is applicable to all from whom we receive benefits; that if even the ox was not to be muzzled, while treading out the grain, much more might the apostles, while conferring such great favors upon men, expect a return of kindness for the relief of their wants.*

Again, in the tenth chapter of this epistle, St Paul compares the favors bestowed upon the Jews whom Moses led out of Egypt, with those bestowed on the first Christians. The Jews, however, he proceeds to remark, notwithstanding the favors they had enjoyed, had at last, in consequence of their sins, perished in the wilderness. Unworthy Christians might, in like manner, lose all the benefits to be derived from their religion, and become objects of severe punishment. His purpose is to warn the Corinthians against bringing destruction upon themselves by indulging in those vices which had been the ruin of the Jews, and to some of which the Corinthians were particularly exposed. In running this parallel between the Jews who were led out from Egypt and the first Christians, he uses one or two turns of expression, which are quite intelligible in their proper sense, but which have, however, been misunderstood, and thus given occasion to the notion, that he interprets allegorically the passages of the Old Testament to which he refers. He says, v. 4;—'And all drank of the same miraculous water; for they all drank

* Comp. 1 Tim. v. 17, 18.—'The Jews,' says Gill in his note on the passage quoted above, 'give many rules relating to this law [*Thou shalt not muzzle an ox whilst treading out grain*], and particularly observe, that it is to be extended to all sorts of creatures as well as the ox, and to all sorts of business; and that what is said of the ox, is much more to be observed with respect to men.'

from the miraculous rock which followed them;* and this rock was the Messiah'—or in other words, was Christ.

By the last declaration the apostle meant that the rock might be regarded as symbolical of Christ; not that it was intended as a type of Christ. As all the Jews had drunk of that water miraculously provided by God, which gushed from the rock of Horeb, so all Christians had drunk of those waters of life which flowed from the Messiah.

In two following passages, the word τύποι occurs in the original, and has been improperly understood to mean *types*; so that St Paul in consequence has been thought to countenance by these passages, the belief of types in the Old Testament. The passages may be thus rendered, v. 6;—'Now all these things were warnings for us, that we should not indulge in sinful desires as they did.'—Again, v. 12;—'All these things happened to them as warnings.'

We render the word τύποι, *warnings*, not *ensamples*, as in the Common Version, nor *patterns*, as in Wakefield. Neither the word *example* nor *pattern*, when thus connected, can be used with propriety except to denote what is a proper subject of imitation, or what has been actually imitated. We have no word in English, which corresponds to the Greek word in its various significations. The term, *warning*, sufficiently expresses its sense in the connexion in which it is used above.

In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and in the Epistle to the Romans, there are no passages requiring attention. The Epistle to the Romans alone is of about the same length as the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, after exhorting them to spiritual unity, St Paul thus proceeds, ch. iv. 5–12;—'There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, he who is over all, pervading all, and in you all. On every one, Christian gifts have been graciously bestowed in due proportion. Thus it is said, *When he ascended on high, he led the captives captive, he conferred gifts on men.* Now what is implied in his ascending on high, but that he even descended to the lower region of the earth? He who descended is the same as he who ascended far above all the heavens, to accomplish all things; and he gave to some to be apostles, some to be public teachers, some to be evangelists, some to be pastors and private teachers; in order that

* The apostle here adopts a tradition of the Jews, that the rock of Horeb, or the fountain which gushed from it, followed their fathers through the wilderness, supplying them with water. See Schoettgen, Wetstein, and Gill on the passage.

they might perfect the holy, execute the work of the ministry, form the body of Christ.'

The words used by St Paul are founded upon a passage in Psalm lxviii. 18. He has been thought by Grotius, and many others, to have applied them in a mystical sense to Christ. But the supposition is unnecessary and improbable. Passing over all mere conjectures respecting the Psalm, it is obviously a hymn of praise to God for his protection of the Israelites, and for the favors which he had conferred upon them. The particular passage referred to, describes, in the Oriental style, God's ascending to heaven in triumph, after subduing his enemies. The words used by St Paul, *He conferred gifts on men*, do not answer to those of the Septuagint, and probably do not express the sense of the corresponding clause, as it stands connected, in the original. The verse quoted is obscure. Perhaps the following is the most probable rendering of it;—'*Thou hast ascended on high, leading captive a multitude of captives, receiving gifts from men, even from the rebellious; there thou dwellest, Lord God.*'

St Paul, it would seem, conceived that the words of the clause in question, would, when taken apart from their connexion, bear the sense which he has put upon them; and using them merely as a rhetorical quotation, he appears not to have been solicitous about their exact meaning in the original. Accommodating the passage to his purpose, he merely adduces this poetical description of the power of God, as presenting a striking picture of his power, as manifested in the establishment of Christianity, in subduing the opposition of its enemies, and in conferring upon men offices and benefits, connected with it. He simply expresses his own conceptions in the language of the Psalmist, giving, as is often done in rhetorical quotations, a turn to the words of one clause, so that they express a sense different from their meaning in the original.

The comment of the apostle upon the words in question, is, again, rhetorical, not argumentative. 'Now what is implied,' he asks, 'in his ascending on high, but that he even descended to the lower region of the earth?'—that is, to the lower region of the universe, which is the earth. The meaning may be thus expressed; 'When it is said, or when I say, that God ascended on high, it is implied in these words that God first descended to earth; that is, (according to the common meaning of this figure,) that the power of God himself was extraordinarily manifested upon earth.' It was by the power of God that Christianity was established, and by him are its blessings conferred. The sen-

tence is without any obvious purpose or connexion except in reference to God. Understand the words of Christ, and we make the apostle imply, that Christ's ascension to heaven proved a previous descent from it. But the premises would afford no support for this conclusion; and the thought would be so foreign from the context, that its introduction would be incongruous. The offices and gifts spoken of in this passage, are in other places referred by St Paul to the appointment of God, not of Christ. See Romans, xii. 3. 1 Cor. xii. 6, 28.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, there is another passage in which St Paul has been thought to give a mystical sense to the words of scripture. After speaking of the love of Christ to the church, of which he is the head, and which is his body, the apostle proceeds, ch. v. 28, 33;—'Thus ought husbands to love their wives, regarding them as their own bodies. He who loves his wife, loves himself. Now no man ever hated his own flesh, but fosters and cherishes it; even as Christ does the Church; for we are members of his body, *of his flesh and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, and they two become one flesh.* This new doctrine is of great worth; I mean that respecting Christ and the church. But do you also, severally, every one love his own wife as himself.'

Instead of the words given above, 'This new doctrine is of great worth,' the Common Version renders, 'This is a great mystery.' The term μυστήριον, rendered *mystery*, is in its primary signification best translated by the word *secret*. When used in the New Testament respecting any doctrine or truth, it means one which has been secret or unknown, but is now revealed. It never denotes one which is obscure or mysterious, because partially incomprehensible. The term *new doctrine*, in general, answers to its meaning as nearly as any which can be conveniently used.

Taking with us this explanation, we shall perceive upon recurring to the passage in Ephesians, that the apostle, in what has been quoted and in what precedes, is running a parallel between the union of husband and wife, and the union of Christ and the church, and between the love which Christ had manifested to the church, and the love which husbands ought to bear their wives. This parallel is founded upon figures familiar to him, of the church being the body of Christ, of which he is the head, and of Christians being members of Christ. After having by a very bold figure described the intimate union between Christ and the church in the words which Adam had ap-

plied to Eve ('we are—*of his flesh and of his bones*'), he passes to the subject of the union between man and wife, and observes that those words contain the reason which was assigned, why a man should leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife; the apostle's main object being to show, how intimate the connexion between them had been considered from the beginning. He then returns for a moment to the union between Christ and the church, and observes that this new doctrine, this doctrine before unknown, because no such union had existed, is of great worth. But perceiving that he had so blended his topics together as to occasion some obscurity, he adds; '*I speak with reference to Christ and the church;*' or, '*I mean that doctrine respecting Christ and the church.*'

In the remaining epistles of St Paul there are no passages which need particular explanation.

We have thus gone through those passages from St Paul, which we believe would be selected by a writer, whose object it was to show that he had given a mystical sense to words of the Old Testament. None of them, when properly understood, seem to afford any foundation for the opinion. But supposing it to have been proved that they do not, more has been proved than is necessary to the present argument. In order to establish a wide difference between St Paul and the writer to the Hebrews, it would be sufficient to show that the mind of the apostle, during that period of his life when he wrote his epistles, was *but little* affected by the prevalent errors of his age, respecting the interpretation of the Old Testament. This alone would be an important and characteristic feature of his writings.

Many of the passages which were quoted from the Epistle to the Hebrews, are clear instances of proper allegorical interpretation. The words alleged by the writer are evidently understood by him in a mystical, or, to express the fact according to modern conceptions, in a merely imaginary, sense. A portion only of the passages which bear this character, have been adduced. The clear examples of allegorical interpretation in the Epistle, exceed the whole number of passages which may be regarded as requiring some explanation in reference to this point, throughout the epistles of St Paul.

There is another view of the subject still more to the purpose. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that the words of the Old Testament, quoted by St Paul, are sometimes taken in a hidden sense; still this sense is not made the basis of any important reasoning; it is not required by the purpose of the epistle; nor

is it woven into its texture, so that any perceptible rent would be occasioned by its removal. It might be taken away, and nothing in its former context would give us notice of its loss. Its existence shows a mere momentary and unimportant acquiescence in, or accommodation to, the errors of the age. But in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the reasoning throughout is founded upon allegorical expositions. They are not accidents of the work, which might be removed without injury to it; they are essential parts of its structure. To attempt to remove the allegorical reasonings of the Epistle, and to leave any thing connected remaining, would be as idle, as to attempt to separate the veins from a slab of variegated marble, without destroying the stone. The writer to the Hebrews is an allegorical reasoner in the full meaning of the term. St Paul is not an allegorical reasoner. The intelligent reader, whose attention has been directed to the subject before us, in passing from the epistles of St Paul to the Epistle to the Hebrews, will soon perceive, that he is conversant with a writer of a different class from the apostle.

Educated as St Paul was, in a Rabbinical school, by one of the most distinguished of the Rabbis, Gamaliel, it is a most striking proof of the intellectual power of the apostle, that he so far, or entirely, disengaged himself from the errors of the learned of his nation, respecting the interpretation of the Old Testament. It is an illustration of his strength of mind, which has not, perhaps, been before remarked. Notwithstanding what must have been his former prejudices, and the conceptions with which he must have been familiar, he has nowhere in his epistles attempted to accommodate to Jesus, any of the allegorical expositions, by which so many passages were made by the Jews to refer, in a mystical sense, to their expected Messiah.

The reasoning of St Paul will not always bear a philosophical scrutiny. But in respect to this subject, there are various considerations to be attended to in order to save ourselves from error. His premises, as stated by him, do not always afford sufficient ground for his conclusions; but he has often stated but imperfectly those which must have existed in his own mind, and which would be readily understood by his immediate readers, though not formally announced. There is frequently a bearing upon the opinions of his time and of those whom he addressed, which will not, at the present day, be perceived, except by one who has studied his epistles intelligently, with the necessary aids. His reasoning, which, at first view, might seem unsatisfactory, will, in many cases, appear striking and forcible, when we have a correct notion of the opinions and sentiments of those for whom

it was designed. And it is further necessary to attend to the fact, that assertions, illustrations, and different modes of presenting the truth, may be, as they often have been, mistaken for arguments, and thus viewed under a wrong aspect. In proportion as we have a just comprehension of the writings of St Paul, we shall perceive throughout, the action of a strong mind, direct in its purposes, ardent in its feelings, occupied in maintaining those fundamental truths, on which the happiness and moral improvement of mankind depended, and raised as much by its moral superiority as by its intellectual powers, above the verbal subtilties, and the merely arbitrary, unfounded modes of reasoning of a particular school. The force of St Paul's reasoning, and the weakness of the reasoning of the writer to the Hebrews, will be most clearly perceived by him who best understands their writings.

From the argument which has now been stated, we conclude, therefore, that St Paul was not the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

This argument has extended to such a length, that we must still defer the remainder of the article to another number.

ART. III.—*The Remains of Nathaniel Appleton Haven. With a Memoir of his Life.* By GEORGE TICKNOR. 1827.

THIS is an unpublished volume, designed only to preserve for the use of friends the written memorials of departed usefulness and genius. We are, however, permitted to avail ourselves of it in the course of our labors, that we may extend to a wider circle the knowledge and influence of an excellent example, and enable him who sought to do good while living, to continue to do good by speaking though dead. If indeed we were to treat this volume as critics, we should have nothing to say which would not gratify the nearest personal friend; for the purity of his heart] and the spotless correctness of his principles, seem to have extended a purifying influence to his intellect and taste, and to have rendered the works of his pen as faultless as the tenor of his life. He was a good and ripe scholar; his writings give evidence of habitual carefulness; never slovenly, always neat, frequently beautiful. Even the editorial articles of a common newspaper became in his hands models of style; and the ephemeral discussions of a literary club appear to have been the subjects of careful thought and execution, to a degree that

very strikingly illustrates that feature of his character, that he carried principle into everything.

But while this posthumous volume has nothing to fear in a literary point of view, but is rather to be numbered with the creditable specimens of American genius and taste in the department of letters, it is on a very different account that we are anxious to introduce our readers to its contents. The titlepage does not say that Mr Haven was a religious man, and that every page of this volume, like every day of his life, illustrates the beauty and consistency of a christian character. Unpretending and unassuming, without loud profession or conspicuous display, he exhibited, in all his walks of life and in every station to which he was called, the equal, consistent, and useful example of one who acts from the high, equal, and useful principles of a firm and habitual faith. His writings are in this respect like his life. They are imbued with a christian spirit. It cannot be separated from them. Upon whatever topic they treat, the uncompromising integrity and purity of the christian morality, rule all and subject all to their standard; and no fit occasion, upon which it might naturally be introduced, is suffered to pass, without recurring to the truth and excellence of that religion, which so many profess to honor and yet forget to commend.

The Memoir prefixed to this volume, is an affectionate tribute, not highly colored, not exaggerated, to the memory of one who deserved to have all the truth told respecting him, and who needed nothing more. It is not a eulogy, not a panegyric, but a simple statement of truth. We shall avail ourselves of its beautiful language, in offering a sketch of Mr Haven's life and character, which we intend to follow with a few extracts from his writings.

He was born in Portsmouth, N. H. on the 14th day of January, 1790.

'Until he was three years old, his general appearance was so unobtrusive, and he took so little interest in the plays and occupations of childhood, that some of his family, and particularly his venerable grandfather, feared he might prove deficient in understanding. But soon after this, a marked change appeared. He learned to read more easily than is common to children; showed great docility and sometimes eagerness in the pursuit of knowledge suited to his years; and very soon gave proofs and instances of selfgovernment, which afterwards became a habit with him, and proved, at last, one of the most remarkable features in his character.' p. xii.

He was graduated at Harvard College in 1807. He was appointed to deliver a poem on the day of Commencement; at which time, however, he was suffering under a violent fever,

which threatened to prove fatal, and from which his constitution received a shock from which it never recovered. The succeeding year he passed in the office of assistant instructer in the Philips Academy, Exeter.

'He was naturally and almost necessarily called upon, in the course of it, to make his final decision as to the profession he would pursue. It was a subject, indeed, on which his thoughts had long been occupied; but its consequences were to decide so much of his future usefulness and happiness, that he now deliberated upon it with new care. His inclinations, for some time, had tended strongly towards divinity. His early education in his father's house had been such as a child receives, who is surrounded with religious influences and guarded by christian affection; but who hears nothing of theological controversy. Very soon, however, he was told by others, of dogmas and creeds, and listened to public instructions from the pulpit, in the severest forms of Calvinism. These he, for some time, believed to be essential to Christianity; and the consequence was, that, in his junior year at college, he was agitated by painful doubts respecting its divine authority. But it was not for a mind like his, long to continue in such bondage. He read Paley's 'Evidences,' the little tract of Priestley's, 'An appeal to the Serious and Candid Professors of Christianity,' and the 'Letters to Wilberforce, by a Layman.' By the careful study of these and other books, he gradually returned to happy and settled views of christian faith, but not to the creed of Geneva. Even before he left college, there are found among his papers proofs of the opening of a devout spirit; and, during the year he now passed at Exeter, they are not to be mistaken. The interest he took in the religious character of his pupils, the zeal and fidelity of his instructions, and the purity of his example, are still fresh in the memory of those with whom he was associated in the task he had undertaken; while many prayers, which he composed at this time, and which still remain among his papers, show how solemn he considered the nature of his duties to be, and how entirely he relied upon God for the strength necessary to fulfil them. Indeed, on all accounts, there can be no doubt, that, from this period of his life, religion constituted the foundation of his character, and essentially governed his conduct and life.

'It was natural, therefore, that, being called at such a time to make choice of a profession, he should have first thought of theology. But many circumstances opposed what, if his inclination alone had been consulted, might probably have been his final choice. His general health was not strong; his eyesight was doubtful; and, besides, he was the only son in his family, who thus seemed to require him to choose no pursuit, that would necessarily remove him from their immediate neighbourhood. He, therefore, reluctantly gave up the study of divinity, and determining to devote himself to the law, left Exeter in the autumn of 1808, carrying with him the permanent attachment of many, who had been drawn to him by the fine talents and interesting qualities in his character, which had there been so fast unfolded.' pp. xv–xvii.

He pursued his professional studies at Portsmouth, with great diligence and a high aim, having an elevated idea of the profession itself, and of its responsibilities and duties.

'It was, I doubt not,' says his biographer, 'in a great degree, because Mr Haven thought so highly of his profession as a moral science, and had so

well settled his opinions about it, even while studying its elements, that he pursued it with such earnestness, perseverance, and success.' p. xix.

He was admitted to the bar in 1811, and designed in the following spring to visit Europe. But a violent inflammation of his eyes came on, which detained him until after the declaration of war in June.

'For three months, he was shut up in a darkened room, and, the greater part of that time, he was confined to his bed, enduring severe pain. Even when he was so far recovered, as to be able to go abroad into the light, the effects of this illness remained in his constitution. During ten years he was able to read only in the daytime; sometimes only a small portion of the day; so that, for a most important period of his life, he was deprived of means of improvement, which seemed to be essential to the kind of success he sought.

'But the beneficial effects of this visitation of God's providence, though, perhaps, not so immediate and certainly not so obtrusive, were more important and lasting. Mr Haven's mind, during this long period of suffering and privation, underwent a striking moral discipline. His thoughts were turned inward, and gained a clearness and exactness, which they never lost afterwards; his powers of reflection and reasoning were strengthened by solitary and silent exercise; his faculties became harmoniously balanced; and his own judgment of himself, of his objects in life, and of the means he possessed to accomplish them, were finally settled. I have no doubt, he was a wiser and better man, for this illness, all his life afterwards.

'Perhaps one circumstance contributed, at this particular time, to give a more than commonly serious direction to his thoughts. In March, 1812, just before he was confined by this distressing illness, he had publicly professed his belief in the christian religion and become a member of the church, over which his venerable grandfather had so long been the pastor. His mind had been, for some months, determined on this point, and, indeed, his education and feelings had long tended to it. But the particular time he selected, was certainly appropriate. He had just finished the study of his profession; the world was more distinctly and immediately before him than it had been at any previous period of his life; and he was just about to encounter its cares and assume its responsibilities. He paused for a moment, therefore, on the threshold, and first publicly dedicated himself to God. In doing this, he neither expressed nor entertained any superstitious feeling. He attributed no particular efficacy to the rite he sought, except as a means of increasing his reverence of the religon he was no less bound to obey without it. He approached the altar of Christianity, therefore, simply in a spirit of great humility, making no professions of his own piety, but humbly expressing his belief, and praying that he might be strengthened to show his faith in his life and conduct.' pp. xxii, xxiii.

In connexion with this passage we would quote a paragraph from a letter written in 1818, in which he bears witness to the benefits received from his trials.

'It is a dangerous habit—because it leads to superstition—to be continually inquiring, why a particular event happened at a particular time, or why it came at all. But believing as we do, in the overruling providence of God, we cannot doubt that every event, proceeding from him, was designed by infinite goodness, and directed by infinite wisdom. I

have no reason to think, that my life has been marked by any peculiar circumstances; yet in looking back upon it, I think I can perceive some good purpose intended or produced by every disappointment or trouble which has befallen me. My first serious impressions were received in sickness; and if they have been preserved or deepened, it has been by repeated attacks of disease. I am certain, that, if I had enjoyed a life of uninterrupted health, I should have been far less deserving of the esteem or affection of my friends. I wish to bring myself, and you, and all my friends, to such a perfect confidence in the goodness of God, as to submit with patience and even cheerfulness, to the discipline of life. I am sure, that we are never nearer to happiness, than when we can speak of the afflictions of life, and, from trust in God, can add, that "none of these things move me."' p. 321.

In 1815 he visited Europe, was at Waterloo a few days after the battle, and returned to the United States in November. In the succeeding January he married; and the picture of his domestic life and principles we must quote at length.

'Few persons have enjoyed more of the purest domestic happiness than fell to his lot, during the ten remaining years of his life;—not that he was without sorrows and disappointments, for he had more than most persons of his age, in the loss of children and friends;—but his marriage was the result of a deep attachment, and its happiness was secured and sustained by the influence of that religion, which is so peculiarly adapted to the quiet and peace of domestic life. He was, too, remarkably sensible to what he enjoyed, and fully aware of the sources from which it flowed. He was married with religious hopes; and the last letter he ever wrote, and one, which was written without any apprehension of his approaching illness and death, bears witness, in a very remarkable manner, to their entire fulfilment. Indeed, in all his relations with his own family, Mr Haven eminently enjoyed the peculiar happiness, which a Christian should seek. For Christianity was not with him a thing of forms and decencies. It was a pervading principle, which entered into all his concerns, all his thoughts, all his hopes. He had no interests so strong or ambitious, that they were not controlled by it; no happiness so reserved, that religion was not a part of it. As the head of a family, in particular, he devoted himself earnestly and continually to the religious instruction and improvement of his household and dependents, drawing the tender minds of his children early to God, and interesting their young and unoccupied hearts in those simple views of religion, which were suited to their simple thoughts and years. Two beautiful and promising children were, at different times, taken from him, when his hopes and happiness in them were as full as a father's ever were. He suffered on both occasions most severely; but each time, as soon as death had set the final seal on his hopes, he collected his family, and, by religious rites and religious persuasions, tranquillized their minds and prepared them and himself to resume, at once, the ordinary duties of life. But he never afterwards seemed to be separated in thought from the children he had thus lost; and, when speaking of them, evidently felt, as if they were only removed to an adjacent apartment, where he should soon and certainly rejoin them. Indeed, in all things and on all occasions, in the even tenor of common enjoyments, in sickness, in sorrow, and in death, whatever might occur, his own spirit and the spirits of those nearest to him remained balanced by religious principle, or if they were disturbed, were disturbed but for a moment; and those who became intimate in the cir-

cle, which his affection had gathered round him, and which his gentleness retained under his influence, felt, that it was good for them to be there.' p. xxvii, xxviii.

A man of such a spirit could not be a useless member of society. He would be on the alert for opportunities to do good. Accordingly Mr Haven devoted much time to public objects; and especially, 'showed himself always willing to make exertions in favor of anything which he thought would tend to raise the religious, moral, and intellectual condition of the whole mass of society in which his life was to be passed.'

He particularly devoted himself to the duties of a Sunday school, which was established by his exertions in the south parish of Portsmouth, and which, through the judgment and spirit which have characterized its management, was singularly successful. It appears to have been framed on a more liberal scale and prosecuted with a more elevated aim than has been by any means common in similar institutions. His labors in this department were most persevering and praiseworthy.

'He gave much time, which he greatly valued, in preparing himself for his lessons, which were sometimes of a character so elevated, that his faculties and knowledge were tasked to fulfil them.——He made a great sacrifice, in giving up his Sundays to this school; for he held it to be very important to make Sunday a cheerful and happy day to his children and family, by giving himself up to them almost entirely. He rose earlier on this day than on any other; and read and conversed much with his children, to whom he succeeded in rendering it, what it certainly always ought to be, the happiest day in the week.

'Mr Haven was interested in few things, during his life, more than in this Sunday school. And this might well be anticipated; for the number of children, who received its instructions, was very great; and, though he had excellent friends, who cooperated with him earnestly, he was himself its moving and governing spirit. That he felt the responsibility and was much excited by it to exertion, there can be no doubt. His papers are full of it. There are many prayers that he offered up for it; great numbers of memoranda, which he used in his instructions; many hints for its improvement and extension; and an excellent practical "Address," which he delivered before its teachers, to explain to them their duties, and urge them to zeal and activity. Let me not, however, be misunderstood. Mr Haven, it is true, sometimes acted on larger masses of the community and in more extensive relations; but for efficient, practical usefulness, few persons have done more than he did in this humble school; and the condition and character of a great number of children, to whom, in the course of eight years, he patiently and discreetly communicated this best and most unostentatious of charities, will long bear a witness to the value of his services, which cannot be mistaken.' pp. xxxi–xxxiii.

While he was thus pursuing the walk of diligent usefulness, every day growing in the respect and confidence of those around

him, and receiving, in various ways, testimonials of the general approbation, so that he began to be regarded as one of those select and honorable few, upon whom all eyes spontaneously turn as the support and strength of the social state, he was suddenly arrested in his course, and taken from the world. The account of his death and the remarks which follow, are in a high degree impressive.

'The attack was violent, and never, for a moment, yielded to the most active medicines, which, in the conflict, seemed to lose their accustomed power. From the nature of the disease, his reason was early affected by it. Of this he was conscious, and made the greater effort to collect and compose his thoughts. At first, he succeeded, and spoke of the objects that had most interested him in life, and of the hopes and principles that had governed him, with the unwavering confidence he had felt, when his health seemed the strongest and most sure. Even when his mind wandered, religious feelings, attachment to his friends, and the desire of doing good still maintained their accustomed ascendency. But it was soon apparent, that the conflict could not be long continued, and, shortly afterwards, his reason failed altogether. His friends saw, that his separation from them was near; and those, who were connected with him through his public services, learned, that they were to lose a supporter, who had long been foremost in whatever concerned the common improvement. The expression of anxiety and sympathy, throughout the community, was remarkable. The very children, as they passed his house, stepped lightly, and were hushed from their sports; and men, in the resorts of business, spoke anxiously to each other, when they talked of their coming loss. He died on the third of June, [1826,] after an illness of eight days; and when he was buried, on the following Tuesday, the principal stores and shops in the town were shut;—a testimony of public sorrow, which has hardly been given to any one among us, who died so young, or to any one, who had borne so small a part in those affairs of the times, which most agitate men's personal interests and passions.

'And what was it,' continues his biographer, 'that made Mr Haven's death such a loss, not to his friends only, but to an extensive community? For his personal appearance and address were neither uncommonly striking, nor uncommonly prepossessing. His talents could hardly be called brilliant, and certainly were not showy. He had less than almost any man, of that love of popularity and distinction, which so often obtains, because it solicits, general favor and regard. And he died young, at the early age of thirtysix, when most men have but just begun to render those services to society, which secure public confidence and gratitude. How was it, then, under these circumstances, that Mr Haven had gathered around him so many friends, made himself the centre of so many differing interests, and come to fill so large a space in whatever concerns the general welfare, that his death brought with it a sense of bereavement, which was felt through all classes of society? It was, because he possessed originally fine powers of mind, which, under a strong and prevalent sense of religious responsibility and by constant and faithful exercise, had been so unfolded and enlarged, that, as he was more widely known, the hopes and confidence of men resorted to him more and more, until they had come to feel, that he was already important to the best interests of the society, with which he was connected; while, at the same time, they looked forward to his growing influence and resources, as to a possession,

which would certainly be used for their own benefit and that of their children. For it was deeply felt, that Mr Haven had devoted his life to the best and highest interests of society, and had shown, even in youth, that he could contribute much to their advancement. To this end, it was obvious, all his relations in life had gradually tended, and all his efforts had become directed. At home, in the quiet and confiding circle of his domestic happiness, the principle of duty and the desire of improvement, though neither ostentatious nor burthensome, had still been perceptible above all others. In his intercourse with numerous family connexions, and still more numerous personal friends, the same influence had always surrounded him, and his religious character especially had wrought with the silent force of example, most effectually when least obtrusive; while, in the management of professional business, in the discussion of public interests, and in the use of means for promoting the progress of society, his motives had always been open and respected, and the power of the community had been freely lent to him; because all with whom he had been associated, felt, that he would use it only for the general welfare. Every year, therefore, as it passed by, had been adding to his influence and consideration, until, at last, his talents, not one of which had been suffered to rust in him unused, had, by their wise and benevolent employment, become so balanced, and the different powers of his character had become so harmoniously adjusted to each other, that men felt a sober and settled confidence in him, which they do not often feel even for the genius they most admire, or the enthusiasm by which they are most willingly persuaded. His death, therefore, was, indeed, a great loss, and was deeply and widely felt. He was mourned for, by the community, as men mourn over their personal losses and sorrows; and the crowd of those whose best interests he had so devotedly served, felt, as they turned back from his grave, that they should long look anxiously round, before they could find one to fill the place he had left vacant; and still longer, before they could find one, who would accomplish the yet greater hopes they had trusted to him for the future, with a fond and undoubting confidence. pp. xxxviii.–xl.

We have quoted freely from the Memoir, because we have been conscious that we should in vain attempt, in our own language, to do the same justice to Mr Haven's character. We must be permitted to add, for the same reason, one further paragraph, in which his religious character is exhibited, in reference to the liberal and generous standing which he maintained in regard to the differences of christian belief.

'Mr Haven was, in truth, a religious man in all things. In his opinions, which he had formed with great care, he belonged undoubtedly, to the class of those who are called Liberal Christians, in distinction from the Calvinists; and yet it is not probable, that his speculations would entirely agree with those of the leaders in any sect; for he was too deeply and solemnly persuaded of his own personal responsibility, to trust any part of his religious character to human authority. He examined the scriptures devoutly, in the unyielding spirit of Protestantism, and received with gladness whatever he was persuaded had been taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. His opinions, therefore, particularly on the most doubtful points of speculation, were not, at every period of his life, precisely the same, nor, at any period, precisely like the opinions of those with

whom he most associated. He, however, who pursues his christian inquiries with such candor and solemnity, is little likely to be imbued with the spirit of sectarism and controversy. Mr Haven was remarkably free from both; and in the latter part of his life especially, he seemed to be further and further removed from them. Desiring, as he did, above every thing else, the improvement and elevation of the condition and character of society, he stood on that high ground, where party dissensions never reach, and where the desire of proselyting men to a sect, is lost in the great and prevalent desire to make them wiser, and better, and happier. Although he was much surrounded with controversy, therefore, Mr Haven did not share its spirit. On the contrary, he always delighted, amidst the conflicts of party, to discover how much of the contention was for words only; and his constant effort was not, to fortify himself in his own opinions, however carefully and conscientiously formed, but to enlarge that common ground, on which all Christians may meet in confidence and charity.' pp. xxviii, xxix.

Without extending further these remarks on the character of the writer, we go on to add a few words respecting the Remains. These are writings in poetry and prose, upon various subjects, and of quite a miscellaneous character; orations on public occasions, papers for a literary club, essays for a newspaper, and letters. These, as we have said, bear distinctly the impress of the writer's character, and sustain throughout an elevated moral tone. Some of them are upon topics expressly moral and religious; and of those which are not, there are many which offer fine illustrations of a moral and religious character. It would not be profitable to discuss the merits of the several pieces, or the subjects which they present to our notice. We think that we shall best illustrate the mind and heart of the author, and satisfy our readers, by offering to them selections from the various portions of the volume, and we begin with quoting, from his oration delivered at Portsmouth in commemoration of the landing of the first settlers, a brief eulogy of the Puritans.

'Of these Puritans, as they existed in England, from their first separation in 1566, I find it difficult to speak in adequate language. That they were men of profound learning, of unblemished morals, of heart-felt piety; that they possessed a knowledge of the scriptures that has never been surpassed, and that they understood in a wonderful degree its practical application to all the workings of the human heart and the varied incidents of human life, will scarcely be denied. I readily admit, that with this knowledge of religion, there were mingled many strange and enthusiastic opinions; that their ardor for religious truth was often inflamed into a fierce and intolerant zeal; that their love of freedom, in its wild and impetuous course, often swept away all form, and precedent, and law. Yet with all their faults and errors, and they were full of them, the whole history of the world cannot present a body of men to be compared with the English Puritans. Religion, always a principle of energy, was with them the spring of every action. Hence there was no coldness, no feebleness in their characters. Accustomed to thoughts that wander

through eternity, they had a lofty contempt of the common pursuits and motives of human life, which, though it sometimes became a morbid exaltation of character and feeling, yet led them to make continually, without effort, and almost without consciousness, the most heroic sacrifices. Where any principle of religion was concerned, or any practice was in question that raised the slightest scruple of conscience, they disdained alike life and death, and trampled in their scorn upon every thing of power, or wealth, or glory that the world could offer. It has been said with truth, that "none can aspire to act greatly, but those who are of force greatly to suffer." The English Puritans did suffer much; and they suffered *greatly*. In all their trials, there was a calm selfpossession, a moral grandeur, a sustained energy. In their stern contempt of danger and suffering, there was no relenting weakness. They endured pain, because they despised it.' pp. 11, 13.

From the oration before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Dartmouth College, we extract a passage respecting the reformation and the bible.

'In reviewing the splendid career of human intelligence, during the last three centuries, it is impossible not to ascribe much of its progress to the reformation of Luther. That great man gave an impulse to society which it has ever since preserved. He taught men to examine, to reason, to inquire. He unfolded to their wondering gaze, a form of moral beauty, which had been too long shrouded from their eyes by the timid dogmatism of the Papal church. It is to Protestant Christianity, gentlemen, that you are indebted for the noblest exercise of your rational powers. It is to Protestant Christianity, that you owe the vigor of your intellectual exertions and the purity of your moral sentiments. I could easily show you how much the manliness of English literature, and the fearless intrepidity of German speculation, and how much even of the accurate science of France, may be ascribed to the spirit of Protestant Christianity. It is from the influence of this spirit, that the sublime astronomy of La Place has not been, like that of Galileo, condemned as heretical. It is to Protestant Christianity, that you owe the English Bible; a volume, that has done more to correct and refine the taste, to elevate the imagination, to fill the mind with splendid and glowing images, than all the literature which the stream of time has brought down to the present age. I hope I am not laying an unhallowed hand upon the Ark of God, if I presume to recommend the Bible to you, as an object of literary enthusiasm. The Bible!—Where in the compass of human literature, can the fancy be so elevated by sublime description, can the heart be so warmed by simple, unaffected tenderness?—Men of genius! who delight in bold and magnificent speculation, in the Bible you have a new world of ideas open to your range.—Votaries of eloquence! in the Bible you find the grandest thoughts clothed in a simple majesty, worthy of the subject and the author.—Servants of God! I need not tell *you* that the glories of immortality are revealed in language, which mortal lips had never before employed!—But I forbear. The Bible is in your hands; and even now, while I am speaking its praise, "it is silently fulfilling its destined course," it is raising many a heart to the throne of God.' pp. 31, 32.

The next extract from the same performance, illustrates the advantages of religious freedom.

'The prevalence of religious controversies may be regarded as another

advantage, in estimating the intellectual condition of our countrymen. Though much evil has arisen, and from the nature of things must arise, from the asperity of party contest, yet subjects of so awful a nature, and so interesting to the feelings and happiness of all, can hardly be discussed without producing some elevation of mind and seriousness of temper. In our country, the maxims and doctrines of the higher philosophy, discourses on the being and attributes of the Deity, and on the nature and destination of the human soul, subjects which among the ancient philosophers were revealed only to the initiated, are matter of daily and hourly conversation. I appeal to the record of past experience, to the general history of mankind, to illustrate the effect of religious freedom. Why is all the literature of Germany at this day confined to her Protestant provinces? Why has Catholic Switzerland never produced a single man, eminent in any art or science, while the Protestant Cantons have been, for two centuries, enlarging the boundaries of human knowledge? Why, in fine, was Catholic France always superior in intelligence to the nations around her, to Spain, to Sicily, to Naples? Because Catholic France was never without heretics; because, even after the revocation of the edict of Nantz, subjects of religious controversy were kept alive by books from Switzerland and Holland, by the manly sense of Grotius, and the subtle infidelity of Bayle. It is impossible that men should be dull and sordid in their feelings, or low and grovelling in their desires, who are familiar with the sublime conceptions of Christian philosophy. And where many minds are ardently engaged in the pursuit of knowledge, on subjects most interesting to their happiness, the impulse is gradually communicated to other classes in the community, and extended to other subjects of research.' pp. 32, 33.

We are glad to oppose to the erroneous assertions of some extravagant clergymen of the present day, the sober judgment of a thinking layman on the subject of miracles.

'In fact, since the first ages of Christianity, the faith has been spread, not by preaching, but by colonization. Nations have become Christian as they have become civilized, by having Christian colonies planted among them; or by falling under the dominion of nations already Christian. There is a striking difference between the first establishment and subsequent extension of Christianity, to which I have already adverted. It was planted in the world by the immediate power of its divine Author, it is left to be extended by the exertions of its feeble professors; just as the understanding is the immediate gift of God; but its improvement or perversion, is left to the care of him who possesses it. For missionaries in the present day, even if their number was increased to their wildest wishes, to expect the success of the apostles, deserves a stronger name than folly or presumption. Their error consists in applying to themselves the directions and the promises given to the inspired apostles. The "foolishness of preaching," which was to convert the world, was preaching attended with miracles; but we have no promise that the preaching of uninspired missionaries shall convert the world.' pp. 49, 50.

There is truth and spirit in the following paragraph on tracts.

'There is another consideration, sir, which with me has irresistible force. The enemies of Christianity, and the foes of good government, have hitherto found Tracts the most powerful instrument for effecting

their purposes. They write no labored treatises; they send forth no Missionaries. It is sufficient for their object to circulate a song, or an anecdote, or to exhibit a caricature. What were the licentious tales of Voltaire, which, month after month, and year after year, spread impurity and corruption, and doubt and discontent, through so much of the civilized world;—what were these but Tracts? What was the "Age of Reason," but a Tract? Think you, that Paine understood and felt the difficulties of revelation, and the plausible objections to Christianity, better than Toland or Tindal or Hobbes? Yet his work is read and circulated, and is even now producing its sad effects upon the weak and the ignorant, while theirs have long since ceased to be found, except in public libraries, and upon the shelves of collectors. And whence this difference? Simply from the fact, that their works were too bulky to be read, except by the studious and the learned, while his was a Tract that could be mastered in half an hour. Their works were like the vegetable poisons, baneful enough in their nature, but offering some security from the very quantity necessary to produce a fatal effect; while his, was the concentrated mineral poison, causing death by a single drop.

'Surely, if ever it be lawful to learn policy from an enemy, it is so here. We have felt the force of these weapons. Our ranks have been thinned by these light arrows, falling silently among us. What remains then for us, but to employ similar weapons? Let us even darken the air with them, that at whatever point the enemy appears, he may be overwhelmed with the arrowy shower.' pp. 53, 54.

But we prefer making our next extracts from his remarks on a subject, in which, as we have seen, he took a deep interest, and on which he wrote with great intelligence and good sense. His Address to Sunday School Teachers is one of the most valuable manuals on religious education that we have seen. It has been already widely known, and therefore we do not quote from it. As the subject, however, is one of increasing interest, we would suggest the expediency of its being printed again in a cheap and accessible form. It would do great good. The passages which we give below, are from a Letter on Sunday Schools, designed to give some account of that in which the writer was engaged; and to point out some of the principles most necessary to be kept in view, in order to render religious instruction efficacious. The whole Letter is deserving the study of those engaged in this good work.

'With regard to our mode of instruction, the grand principle is, that religious instruction, to be effectual, must be adapted to the actual state of the child's mind—it must, therefore, necessarily be by familiar conversation. The getting of lessons is of very little consequence, except as it affords an opportunity for asking and answering familiar questions. The course of instruction, therefore, and the books used, are very different in different classes, and are constantly varying in the same class. This whole business is left to the teachers, who best know the wants and capacities of those under their care, with this only restriction, that no new book shall be introduced without the knowledge and approbation of the superintendents. * * *

'We discourage lessons *memoriter*, except among the smaller classes.

'The class which I have at present, I took somewhat more than a year

ago. It consists of boys from eleven to thirteen years old, and is one of the oldest and most advanced in school. They had learned about half of Cummings's "Questions," when they passed under my care. I carried them through that book twice; then through Porteus's "Evidences;" then Paley's "Natural Theology;" and they are now beginning Watts's "Improvement of the Mind." They have, at the same time, passed through "The Acts" in course, in the following manner;—I gave every Sunday a lesson of about twenty verses; from these they were required to frame as many questions, as they could imagine, and bring them to me, in writing, on the next Sunday. We then compared their several questions together, and talked about them, and answered them. This has brought into use all the knowledge I possess, and required a great deal more. One of my boys brought to me one hundred and fifty questions, and another ninetysix from the first chapter of "The Acts." Read it, and you may judge of their industry, as well as their ingenuity. I am now, at their repeated request, to begin an examination of the doctrines of Christianity. I have not yet settled my plan; but I foresee it will cause me some labor. Porteus's "Evidences" I found was not an interesting book to them. It became necessary to prepare a sort of commentary of historical facts, to fix their attention upon it, and on the whole it did not succeed well. But Paley's "Theology" was a delightful book—it arrested and fixed their attention beyond hope.

'You will perceive from this account, that almost every thing depends upon the teachers; and I take pleasure in telling you, that from our experience the teachers can be depended upon, for almost every thing. Some of those connected with our school have the children at their houses to explain and illustrate more at large than they can do at school. And the children are not only willing to attend at such times, but are pleased with it. Instruction has been made interesting, and they are willing to go out of the way to get it. * * *

'The children should *not* be collected by the clergymen; they will not have half the success of laymen. It is their profession to talk of the importance of religious instruction, and in their visits to irreligious families, such conversation passes as words of course. But send a lawyer or a merchant, and the very novelty of the thing excites attention. Besides, the influence of the minister should be reserved for greater occasions.

'A division of classes, according to age, is impossible. We have sometimes put together children of five years and of eleven years; and that because they required precisely the same kind and degree of instruction. An intelligent child of a religious family, will know as much of religious truth, and will be as capable of understanding religious truths, at six years old, as the unsettled children about the streets know or can understand at thirteen years. I had a boy at school two years ago—and a very smart boy too—who, at ten years old, was, with difficulty, made to comprehend what was meant by God. You might as well arrange them according to the color of their hair, as according to their ages. * * *

'A very inadequate opinion prevails, of the nature of the instruction to be given at Sunday schools. If it be only the asking a certain number of prescribed questions, and receiving a certain number of prescribed answers,—if it be only catechising,—you may spare yourself any further pains. You have only to turn over the whole school to the town crier, and let them be taught to recite by platoons. But if you desire to awaken their faculties, to watch the first glimmerings of piety, to feed the flame without extinguishing it, you must study the character and habits of the child, you must adapt your mind to his, and your language to his, and by a very constant course of cross-examination, be certain that you are rightly

ly understood, and that you have made the impression you intended to make. And for all this, what are fiftytwo days in a year? * * *

'I think the minister should *not* attend the school. Religious instruction from him, or in his presence, is too much a thing of course. Besides, if your teachers are to talk with the children (and their instruction is worth nothing, if they do not), many of them will be embarrassed by the presence of their minister. They will be afraid to talk freely, lest he should hear them. Besides, there may be important occasions, when the clergyman may be called in, with powerful effect, and his presence should not be made too common. I say nothing of the great labor which your plan would impose upon the minister on the Sabbath, when he can ill afford the time or strength. * * *

'Children do not become pious, by getting lessons of piety. As the teacher can certainly learn as fast as the children, I can see no reason why they should not carry the same class onward to an indefinite progress. It should be impressed upon them, that it is a school for themselves, as well as the children; that "he who watereth shall be watered himself."' pp. 185–192.

We shall close our extracts with an account of the author's visit to Mrs Barbauld.

'I left the building wearied and displeased; and gladly threw myself into the carriage, and drove to Stoke Newington to visit Mrs Barbauld. I found her an agreeable, sensible woman, with infinite good nature in her countenance and manner; but nothing that denoted a very powerful mind, or even marked the rank which she really holds among literary females. A volume of Mr Buckminster's sermons lay upon the table. She told me that it had been her constant companion ever since she received it; that the sermons were the best in the world, uniting the good sense of the English, with the fervor of the French divines. We talked of the comparative state of learning in England and America; and she confirmed all the accounts, which I heard before, of the deplorable ignorance of the lower classes in this country. Numerous as the learned and well informed persons undoubtedly are, seven persons in eight are unable to read and write. She says it will be time enough for America to write books in the next century,—she ought now to be cultivating her soil, and laying in a stock of learning and taste, to be employed, when the glories of England have passed away. She deprecated the introduction of large manufactories among us, and especially the employment of young children in them. An attempt, she added, was making to procure an act of Parliament, prohibiting the employment of children, under ten years of age, for more than ten hours a day. How great must be the evil, when such is the remedy! She did not appear to have a very accurate notion of the geography of America, and I have found no one who had. They seem to think here, that Boston, Philadelphia, and Washington, lie close together, like Liverpool, Manchester, and Bristol.' pp. 299, 300.

There are one or two passages of a religious character in the correspondence, which we have a special desire to present to our readers, but feel ourselves forbidden by the personal and private allusions which they contain. We therefore close our extracts from this volume, with a feeling of reverence for the memory of him whose mind and heart are recorded in it, and an earnest prayer that his example may stimulate others to devote their talents in like manner to the service of religion and the benefit of man.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. The Exclusive System. A Discourse delivered in Groton, Massachusetts, at the Installation of Rev. Charles Robinson, November 1, 1826. By James Walker. Boston, Bowles & Dearborn, 1827. 8vo. pp. 56.

We believe this Discourse has already been very extensively circulated; but, as our work may go into the hands of some who may not have seen it, we feel it our duty to recommend it to their notice. It sets a most interesting and important subject in a new and striking light, and is marked throughout with great distinctness of statement and great originality and force both of thought and expression. Indeed, we do not know that the Unitarian controversy has produced an abler performance, or one that better deserves the careful attention of thinking men.

---

2. Unitarian Christianity free from Objectionable Extremes. A Sermon, preached at the Dedication of the Unitarian Church, in Augusta, Geo. December 27, 1827. By Samuel Gilman, Pastor of the Second Independent Church, Charleston, S. C. Charleston, James S. Burges, 1828. 8vo. pp. 44.

We have often expressed our pleasure on receiving this writer's productions, and it has become a matter of course with us to expect something ingenious and striking in whatever comes from his pen. We have not been disappointed in respect to the sermon before us. Though not perhaps in all points so finished a composition as we have seen from the same source, yet it possesses the higher excellences of pulpit addresses in a degree that will add to the reputation of the preacher. The introduction, which is devoted to the 'task of specially analyzing the causes of mutual congratulation' belonging to the occasion of dedicating a new house of worship, we think rather too long, though it is remarkably appropriate and eloquent. Mr Gilman's leading design is to show that 'Unitarian Christianity, as a system of religion and morals, is perfectly free from every doctrinal extravagance, every practical excess and every formidable difficulty, with which other systems of opinion are chargeable.'

In discussing this subject, he refers to a great variety of topics, in respect to which religionists of different sects have been found at 'opposite, offensive, and dangerous extremities,' while 'Unitarian Christianity preserves the midway path' of truth and safety. Unitarianism, for instance, 'is infinitely removed from Atheism on the one side, since the very basis of our whole system, and the fact from which it derives its name, is, that there is ONE Living and True God. It is equally removed, on the other side, from Polytheism, or from any of those forms of belief, which, as far as language has any meaning, imply the existence of two, or three, or more, distinct, and independent Gods.' Another of the extremes alluded to, 'is Deism, between which and Unitarianism there is an immeasureable distance. The Deist rejects a revelation, denies the truth of the bible, and considers God as sitting apart from all concern in the moral creatures whom he has formed. The Unitarian, on the contrary, embraces a revelation with his whole heart, believes devoutly in the truth of the bible, adores a superintending Providence, relies on the offering of prayer, acknowledges his immediate responsibleness to his Creator, and adopts the sanctions of a future state of retribution. But he vibrates not over to what he esteems the opposite point of the arch, viz. that revelation and reason are at variance.' Unitarianism is then considered in relation to Judaism and Mahometanism. It is next contrasted with Trinitarianism in respect to the nature and character of Jesus Christ. It neither *deifies* him, nor reduces him to the level of a *mere man*. We cannot refrain from quoting the following remarks under this head, as a specimen of the author's manner of illustrating obscure points of doctrine.

'But what is the essential point, the real heart of the *difference* which separates the two parties? It is this. Unitarians believe that the Father and the Son are intimately CONNECTED. Trinitarians maintain that the two beings are in some way mysteriously IDENTIFIED. *They* imagine that one person had at the same time a divine and a human nature. *We* believe that the divine nature *filled* the human with its unspeakable effluences. The doctrine of Trinitarians is equivalent to asserting that a single object can at the same moment possess the nature of fire and water. The doctrine of Unitarians is but analogous to the assertion that the heat of fire may pervade and become intimately *mingled* with the water. Thus we avoid the inadmissable extreme just mentioned, with which

our opponents are chargeable; and also the opposite extreme, which they so mistakenly ascribe to us, of reducing, as it were, the water to a mere mass of ICE.

'That you may perfectly understand our mutual opinions on this point, I will further try to explain the matter by a clear and familiar illustration. Suppose some rich, powerful, and benevolent friend should make you a present of a golden cup. If the vessel contained nothing, I allow that it would be a "*mere*" *golden cup.* But suppose that your friend had *filled* that cup with some infinitely precious cordial, some elixir of immortal life, which you could obtain from no other quarter in existence. Would it *then* be right to say that he had given you a *mere cup?* Now I frankly assure you that Unitarians regard the Saviour not as the mere golden cup, not as a mere man, but as that cup filled with the precious elixir of life; and in this point of view they gratefully receive him from the hand of God, invested with divine authority, filled with heavenly wisdom, and laden with eternal blessings to mankind. But what do our Trinitarian brethren insist upon? They say, your cup is worth nothing, and all that it contains is worth nothing, because it is not equal to the friend who gives it, and because it does not possess his nature! If this be not an unwarrantable *extreme* in doctrine, I know not what is; but it is certainly an extreme of which Unitarians are not guilty.' pp. 23–25.

The other topics of the discourse are, divine influences; atonement; future punishment; divine decrees, foreknowledge, and predestination; views and uses of the bible; rules and principles of scriptural interpretation; points of religious ceremony; matters of church government; and methods of propagating opinions. In respect to all these points, the preacher shows, in a very satisfactory manner, that Unitarian Christianity is at equal distances from every kind of speculative and practical extreme, and hence happily discloses a new and strong proof in its favor.

Having thus accomplished the purpose which he proposed to himself, he concludes with the following expression of confidence in the ultimate prevalence of the religious system of which he has shown himself so able an advocate.

'That such a system will not eventually prevail, I entertain no fears whatever. Calculating, not as the member of a sect, but as an observer of human nature, I am entirely persuaded that the present outrageous and disproportioned prejudice against Unitarianism, must, from the very nature of things, ere long experience a reaction. The coming generation will wonder, what excesses of immorality, what daring acts of impiety, what freaks of folly and absurdity, exhibited by Unitarianism, could provoke in their fathers so much hostility against it. Even now it finds some professed advocates in almost every church in Christendom. Even now there are innumerable unconscious Unitarians in all churches, who scarcely dare to think that they are so, but who have no other mode of explaining their meaning, when the touchstone of inquiry is applied to their belief. Even now, also, nearly every week brings tidings of some new church being established on these dear and sacred principles, in spite of a compacted and persevering enginery of bitter opposition, which would overwhelm any other cause in the world, but one founded on the first principles of everlasting truth. For every single individual who abandons Unitarianism, it is an undeniable fact, that more than one whole congregation accedes to the system. And such, I see and feel, will be the proportion of its progress to that of its decline, for centuries to come. Unnumbered serious, pious, and conscientious inquirers, when shocked by the excesses, and staggered by the difficulties, in which the present popular systems of Orthodoxy are involved, yet still more shocked and staggered by the opposite excesses and difficulties attending on irreligion and infidelity, must, I devoutly believe, after vibrating from opinion to opinion, and from doubt to doubt, find no place for their trembling, wearied souls to rest in, but that blessed poise of Unitarian Christianity, through which the directest line is drawn from earth to heaven.' pp. 41–43.

---

3. Johnson's English Dictionary, as improved by Todd, and abridged by Chalmers; with Walker's Pronouncing Dictionary, combined: to which is added, Walker's Key to the Classical Pronunciation of Greek, Latin, and Scripture Proper Names. Boston, Charles Ewer and T. Harrington Carter. 1838.

This work is the result of indefatigable pains, and will deservedly supersede the use of all other manuals yet published in this country.

---

4. A Discourse, preached at the Dedication of the Bethlehem Church, in Augusta, Maine, October 18, 1837. By Alvan Lamson, Minister of the First Church in Dedham, Mass. Augusta, Eaton & Severance, 1837. 12mo pp. 32.

THE object of this Discourse, a companion for the one by Mr Lamson noticed in our last volume, is, 'to explain, not the basis of our confidence in the Saviour, but the manner in which we build on him as the foundation of our piety, our virtue, our solace and hope; in other words, to show the use we make of his doctrines, example, cross, and resurrection; with a more particular view to a refutation of the popular charges brought against us, that we substitute human speculations for the simple teachings of God's Spirit, and that our faith is but one remove from infidelity.' In the prosecution of this design, the preacher first meets and refutes the popular charge that Unitarians are the worshippers of reason, in opposition to revelation, when in fact their faith is strictly scriptural, and alone of all the creeds of Christendom, can, in all points, be stated in plain scripture language, 'built,' in the words of this text, 'upon the

foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.' First, it is shown how Unitarians rest upon Christ's doctrines, not upon creeds of human invention secondly, how they build upon his character, to which their views of his person give peculiar efficacy as an example; and lastly, that they rest upon his suffering and resurrection, not because they believe his death has satisfied the divine vengeance for our sins, or was a 'sort of tragic representation or show, without which pardon could not be dispensed to the penitent,' but because it interests their sympathies, is proof of his sincerity, of his devotion to the cause of human salvation, and because, in connexion with his resurrection, it is an evidence of the truth of his doctrines, and a confirmation of our own hopes of immortality. Remarks follow upon the office of reason in the matters of religion, which are forcible and just, and from which we would gladly make extracts had we the space to spare for them. The last objection to Unitarianism that is noticed, is, its alleged tendency to infidelity; a charge continually and impudently brought against it, although 'several of the ablest and most esteemed advocates for the truth of Christianity have been advocates, also, for our peculiar views of its doctrines, as far, at least, as relates to the supremacy of the Father, and the inferior and derived nature of the Son, and several of the greatest minds, the ornaments of science, of letters, and of humanity, have embraced them—Emlyn, and Clarke, and Whitby, and Cappe, and Watts, and Milton, and Locke, and Newton. It seems a little remarkable that a system in which such minds have rested and found solace—a system from the bosom of which has issued a large mass of arguments and illustrations, constantly appealed to by all classes of believers, as well adapted to repel the attacks of infidels, and fortify the faith and hopes of the Christian, should be charged with a tendency to skepticism.' But in fact Unitarianism is the most effectual, and let us add, as we believe, the only effectual remedy against that very infidelity of which it is slanderously reported to be the friend and ally. It is what has passed for Christianity which infidels have rejected, not Christianity itself; and in attempting to separate the true from the false in religion, to strip it of its disguises, and present it in that native simplicity in which it dropt from the lips of Jesus of Nazareth, Unitarianism is at this moment doing more for the destruction of infidelity, than, we had almost said, even Calvin, with all his absurdities and horrors, has ever done to produce and to justify it.

Mr Lamson has long stood high as an advocate of the system of faith we hold, and it is no small commendation of this performance to say that his reputation will not suffer from it.

---

5. The Peculiar Features of Christianity. A Sermon preached at the Dedication of the Meetinghouse of the Second Parish in Saco, and the Installation of the Rev. Thomas Tracy as their Pastor—November 21, 1827. By F. W. P. Greenwood. 12mo. pp. 22.

THE text of this sermon is in these words;—'And they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?' &c. After remarking upon the disposition with which the Athenians made this inquiry, the main subject of discourse is stated to be, the manner in which they characterized St Paul's teaching. 'They called it a *new* doctrine. And they rightly called it so. It was a new doctrine; differing in several most important points from all previous religions, and omitting many things which the world had come to regard as essential to religion.' It is with these distinguishing characteristics of Christianity, therefore, 'that cause it to stand by itself, alone and eminent among the religious systems of the earth,' which the discourse before us undertakes to state and illustrate. First, 'Christianity is not burthened with rites, forms, and ceremonial observances,' but is eminently a spiritual religion. Secondly, our religion is distinguished for 'the indifference which it manifests toward all indifferent things. It speaks but languidly or speaks not at all, of those minute ordinances and small concerns, about which there is such an imposing display in other systems of religion.' Again, 'it is a religion of peace,' and, 'unlike all others, it occupies itself chiefly in regulating the passions and subduing the excesses of men, and in recommending and striving to inculcate and impart the humble, modest, mild, and retiring virtues.' It teaches, and is the only religion that does teach, the doctrine of the resurrection, and is especially distinguished 'by the circumstance that it

confers no extraordinary powers on an established priesthood, and that it makes the offices and duties of religion the property and concern, more of the community, and less of a distinct order, than has been done in any other system of faith.' The last of its peculiarities mentioned, is its want of mystery. After showing that in the scriptural sense of the term, mystery 'means something which was not known or fully understood before the christian dispensation, but which was perfectly intelligible in itself, and which it was the office of Christianity to manifest and declare,' and that 'in the common and modern sense of mystery, the word is nowhere to be found in our scriptures,' there follows a paragraph which we quote as a specimen of the general style of this excellent sermon, in the hope that it will excite in our readers a wish to read the whole of it.

'I would repeat then, that Christianity has no mysteries; no mysteries in the common and popular acceptation of the term. It is an intelligible religion. He who runs, may read, while he is running, its most important and essential principles. It explains and elucidates the useful subjects of faith, instead of lifting them up above all possibility of comprehension. It is a light, and not a mist. Its few sublime doctrines were intended to be easily and readily understood, so that they might be deeply impressed, and might serve to animate and support men through this life, and guide them to another. It instructs, not confounds. It assists reason, not bewilders, contemns, and renders it useless. It is *a revelation*; and to talk of a mystery of revelation is to put two words together, which contradict each other. A revelation may unfold and explain mysteries, but it can hardly propose and inculcate them. Therefore is Christianity distinguished from other religions, and therefore does it stand high above them, the simple, useful, complete, and glorious truth of God.' p. 20.

The following is a recapitulation of the leading topics of discourse.

'The really distinctive character of our religion, as I have endeavoured to set it forth, may thus briefly be summed up. It is simple, intelligible, spiritual, and practical. To these qualities, in all their purity and force, no other religion, which is or ever was, professed on earth, can lay a rightful claim; and on these, as on a sure and immutable basis, I would establish the originality and the superiority of the religion of Christ.

'I am of course understood to have spoken of Christianity as I read it in its own sacred records, and not as I see it in the creeds, rites, formalities and dogmas of the majority of the visible church. I have made simplicity its chief characteristic. Simplicity may be regarded as of little value by those who are attached to a complicated and mysterious Christianity, and I know that it may seem to them not to have been worth naming as a peculiarity of our faith. They have a right to think so; but to me and to others, simplicity is beauty, and glory, and truth.' p. 21.

---

6. The Right of Universalists to Testify in a Court of Justice Vindicated. By a Member of the Bar. Boston, Bowles & Dearborn, 1827. 8vo. pp. 24.

It seems that a late decision of the Circuit Court of the United States in Rhode Island, has been greatly misunderstood and misrepresented. It has been said to deny the competency as witnesses of Universalists, or such as do not believe in a future retribution. This was denied by professor Stuart of Andover, it is true; but not by the Court abovementioned. The judge merely refused to admit the testimony of a man who had no religious belief whatever, in which case the taking of an oath would have been an idle mockery. The pamphlet before us is occupied rather with showing this to be sound law, than with a particular argument to prove the competency of Universalists, though this is clearly established. Much interesting legal learning is brought out in the discussion, and the perusal of it has inspired us with great respect for the author's talents, and with gratitude for the high entertainment afforded by his pages.

---

7. The Name of Christian the only appropriate Name for Believers in Christ. A Sermon, preached at the Dedication of the Third Congregational Church in Cambridge. Dec. 25, 1827. By Charles Lowell, Minister of the West Church in Boston. Cambridge, Hilliard, Metcalf, & Co. 1828. 8vo. pp. 24.

This is a very ingenious discourse, highly creditable to the head and heart of the writer. But we think he has proposed to himself an unattainable object. He quotes scripture to prove his point, it is true; and from the passages he adduces some may think it established that Christian is the only name a Christian ought to bear. But the same scripture tells us that there must be heresies, and it seems to us that there must be names for them too. Our author anticipates this objection, but we think has not removed it. Why, the very name, Christian, has become the name of a party among Christians, and it is a fact, which, to our minds, shows clearly how hopeless it is to think of banishing party appellations. The *thing* has always existed, and while the human mind is constituted as it is

always will exist; and where, after all, is the harm of a name for it? Every thing else has a name, and why should not this? It is at least a convenience, and the very attempt to avoid it, is itself but the setting up one rallying point more, and, so far as the name only is concerned, where is the mighty difference between a Calvinistic or Unitarian party, and a party No Party, which would enevitably be the result?

---

8. Letters of an English Traveller to his Friend in England, on the 'Revivals of Religion,' in America. Boston, Bowles & Dearborn, 1828. 18mo. pp. 142.

We may speak of this work more at length hereafter; but we esteem it our duty, now that the charm of novelty is fresh about it, to do the little we can towards extending its circulation, by giving it our cordial recommendation. We are not altogether pleased with the machinery of fiction with which it is got up, nor the manner in which that machinery is managed. But, as a calm, dispassionate, impartial exposition of the evils of popular revivals, of the manner in which *they* are got up, their causes, and general character, we know of no work, since Chauncey's Things of a Bad and Dangerous Tendency, that can compare with it. Besides, it is beautifully, as well as faithfully written, and the reader may be assured of a high gratification for his taste, as well as an access to his fund of knowledge of the human heart, and of the way of improving his own, when he takes it up for perusal. In the present agitated state of the community on the subject of religion, it is a most seasonable gift to the public.

---

9. A Sermon delivered at Lunenburg, December 2, 1827, by David Damon, at the Close of his Ministry in that Town. Lancaster. F. & J. Andrews, 1828. 8vo. pp. 24.

In this Discourse the preacher passes in review the doctrines he had been accustomed to preach to his people, and states the arguments which he thinks of most weight for disbelieving in a trinity of persons in the Godhead. He has thus given a very concise and clear statement of Unitarian opinions, which we hope may do something towards the removal of those misrepresentations of our faith, which have been so industriously circulated, and which have made it the terror of uninformed Christians. There is a touching simplicity in the closing pages of the sermon before us, for which, if it be not eloquence, we cannot find a name.

---

10. Means by which Unitarian Christians may refute Misrepresentations of their Faith. A Discourse delivered at Townsend, Massachusetts, February 10, 1828. By Nathaniel Thayer, D. D. Minister of Lancaster. Lancaster, F. & J. Andrews, 1828. 8vo. pp. 16.

Without pretending fully to justify the measures of the Unitarians of Townsend, we have in the occurrences of the day on which this Discourse was delivered, a precious illustration of the spirit and effects of the Orthodox exclusive system. It seems that the Unitarians constitute a large majority of the town. Their minister, till the system just named went into operation, had been in the custom of exchanging with Liberal ministers. He has for years been urged to resume that practice, but without effect. At last the town took the matter into their own hands, and voted that the pulpit should, for ten Sabbaths, be filled by Unitarians. The minister promised not to contend against the wishes of his people, but on Dr Thayer's acquainting him with his expectation to preach the next day, according to an invitation he had received, the Rev. Mr Palmer assured him that he would not hear him, but intended to preach himself. The Selectmen were firm, the minister pertinacious, and the result was, that upon his giving verbal notice in the meetinghouse that he should go to the schoolhouse, and hoped his friends would go with him, the assembly in the sanctuary was reduced about one fourth. Dr Thayer's sermon is characterized by good sense, and clear and explicit statements, and was well adapted to the occasion on which it was preached.

---

11. An Address, delivered at Kennebunk, before the York County Unitarian Association, October 24, 1827. By Henry Ware, Jr. Minister of the Second Church in Boston. Kennebunk, James K. Remick, 1828. 12mo. pp. 36.

This is another excellent tract in explanation and defence of Unitarian Christianity, for which we are indebted to the author's indefatigable zeal for the diffusion of the simple truth, as it is in Jesus, and which, if it obtain the wide

circulation it deserves, it will be the means of producing much good.

---

12. A Discourse on Regeneration. By Bernard Whitman of Waltham. Boston, Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 60.

We are glad to see the author of the sermon on Denying the Lord Jesus, again in print. The discourse before us appears while our present sheet is going to press, and we have time only to say that upon a hasty perusal it exhibits the preacher's usual plainness, directness, and power. He has chosen a most important subject, and appears to have done it justice.

---

13. A Sermon on the Nature and Extent of Christian Liberty. By John White, Minister of the Third Parish in Dedham. Dedham, H. & W. H. Mann. 1828. 8vo. pp. 27.

This is an able sermon on an interesting and important subject. It is particularly seasonable at this time of Orthodox encroachment, and indeed, is of a class of writings for which we are afraid there will be an increased necessity amongst us.

---

14. The Recent Attempt to defeat the Constitutional Provisions in Favor of Religious Freedom, considered in reference to the Trust Conveyances of Hanover Street Church. By a Layman. Second Edition. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 24.

To the intrepid and eloquent defender of religious liberty who is, we believe, the author of this pamphlet, we already owe the public exposure, and in a great measure, the defeat, of one of the most daring attacks which was ever made on the equal rights of conscience in this State. At the time when some of the heads of the Orthodox party were plotting to bind down our free thoughts by the odious measure of an Ecclesiastical Consociation, it was this Layman who caught them at their forge, put out their fire, scattered their chains, and so effectually revealed their machinations to the indignant view of the public, that they did not dare to return to their Dominican employment again. And now, when the same spirit which animated the former attempt, is at work, on a smaller scale, to force Calvinism on posterity by the ingenious expedient of Trust Deeds, the same person has protested against the usurpation, and we may venture to predict that it will be with the same success, as far as the different nature of the case will admit. We recommend the pamphlet to universal perusal. As it bears the marks of being rapidly written, it is probable that one or two of its immaterial statements may be contradicted and disproved; but we are sure that its main positions will not and cannot be shaken.

---

15. Duty and Privilege of Christians to devote their all to Spreading the Gospel. By David Campbell. Second Edition. Northampton, Hiram Ferry. 1828. 8vo. pp. 16.

The advertisement to this pamphlet contains the following note to the author, signed by H. Humphrey, R. Washburn, E. Hitchcock, N. Perkins, Jr., and S. M. Worcester, three of them members of the Faculty of Amherst College. 'Dear Sir,—The undersigned having examined a pamphlet on the "Duty and privilege of Christians to devote their all to Spreading the Gospel," are of opinion that the publication is injudicious. The spirit is such as we cordially approve. But there *is* nothing original or new in the pamphlet, nothing that is not perfectly familiar to all who read the religious works of the day, nothing that seems to call for special attention.

'While we highly appreciate Mr Campbell's motives, we most affectionately and earnestly advise him not to publish another edition,' &c. Do these gentlemen adopt the broad principle laid down in these pages, and is that principle advocated in the religious works of the day? With them, we can discover in the pamphlet very little besides, either to find fault with, or to commend. Decidedly the best thing it contains, is their advice.

---

16. Letter from a Gentleman in Boston to a Unitarian Clergyman of that City Boston, T. R Marvin. 1828. 12mo. pp. 20.

17. Reply of a Unitarian Clergyman to the 'Letter of a Gentleman of Boston.' Boston, Wait, Greene & Co. 1828. 12mo. pp. 24.

18. Review of a 'Letter from a Gentleman of Boston to a Unitarian Clergyman of that City.' Boston, Wait, Greene & Co. 1828. 12mo. pp. 24.

Too much has been said of this Letter already. All we would remark respecting it, is, that it has surprised us, if anything from that quarter could surprise us, that no man of the Orthodox

party has shown himself honest enough to warn the public against attributing too much importance to any instance of conversion as an argument for the truth of any set of opinions. In the case of the most gifted and best balanced minds the argument is of extremely little, if of any weight. How insignificant then does it become in the case of a mind of very ordinary powers, and those exposed to the influences of a warm and excitable temperament. It is an argument, too, which may be pressed into the service of all sects, and for the truth of all the most contradictory doctrines. We have before us at this moment the title of a work, which is attracting the same kind of attention among the Catholics of England, that this Letter receives from the Orthodox of this country, and with just as much reason. It is as follows: 'The Triumph of Truth in the Conversion of the Rev. T. A. Mason from the Errors of Methodism to the Catholic Faith. *Written by Himself.* London. October, 1827.'

INTELLIGENCE.

Correspondence of the Unitarian Association.—The Executive Committee of this Association have permitted us to transfer to our pages, from time to time, such parts of their correspondence as we may think will be generally interesting to the religious public. A rich source of information respecting the religious state of various and distant parts of our country, is thus opened to our readers, of which we should have availed ourselves to a greater extent in our present number, had our limits allowed of it. The following extracts, however, under different heads, lay us under great obligations.

Unitarianism in Georgia.—We some time ago gave an account of Mr Gilman's preaching in Augusta, Georgia, and we have now before us a letter from that place, from which we make the following extracts.—'You requested me to write you respecting the situation and prospects of the Unitarian Society in this place. * * * Mr Gilman and Mr Whitaker's preaching brought together large audiences, and the prospects were, a year since, that a very large society would soon be formed. [But circumstances occurred which] disheartened for a time the friends of Unitarianism here, which was the cause of great rejoicing to its enemies. But the Society did not despair. With a laudable spirit of perseverance, they in the course of the summer made arrangements for building a church. It is a neat little building in a central part of the city. [It was on Dec. 27th, 1827, dedicated to the service of the One God by Rev. Mr Gilman, of Charleston, S. C. and Rev. Mr Briggs of Lexington, Mass. A notice of Mr Gilman's sermon is given in our present number.] The Society has its full share of the most respectable inhabitants of the city, but it is as yet small in number. * * * I think that the success of Unitarianism in Georgia will depend much upon its success here. There are in Savannah a number of Unitarians, who are looking to this Society for example and encouragement, and if this experiment succeeds, [we believe there is now but little doubt of its success,] there will soon be a society formed in that place. When I was there, I conversed with several Unitarians, who assured me they had the materials for one, and waited for nothing but a preacher to call them forth and embody them.'

Marietta, Ohio.—'The public opinion in this vicinity,' says a corrsepondent of the American Unitarian Association, 'is very much changed within six or nine months. A spirit of inquiry is abroad among the people. Light is bursting upon them, and they joyfully receive it. The Trinitarians of this place and vicinity are pouring out their vials of wrath upon all Liberal Christians, who dare to deny the trinity, and hold to the unity of God. The most abusive language is fulminated from the sacred desk upon all who deny that our Saviour, Jesus Christ, is the almighty, omniscient, omnipresent, everlasting God, when they acknowledge he is now sitting at the right hand of God, interceding for poor deluded fellow men. They pray for us. * * * I have pity for them. They have

been educated in the belief of three persons in one God, and that seven tenths of mankind are to suffer eternal torments in a lake of fire and brimstone; and to change this opinion by reading the scriptures correctly, putting a rational construction upon those passages which are not so clear in their meaning, would be extreme agony to them.

'We are told from the desk of the Congregational Society, by the Rev. ——, that "all those who do not believe that Jesus Christ, by the revelation made of himself, is the almighty and everlasting God, are either madmen or brutes." This I heard myself. * * *

'The Rev. Mr P—— of ——, Massachusettts, was with us four sabbaths. He gave great satisfaction. We were sorry to part with him. Some sixteen or eighteen years ago, more than one third of the inhabitants of this town were so far distinct in their views of scripture doctrine from those who call themselves infallible, that a society was formed called Universalist; but I am told at this day by some of the leading members of the society, that in reality not ten members are of different opinions from those of the Unitarian Association of New England. It was this society that paid Mr P., and they would have paid $500 *per annum* had he remained.

'I received a letter in June from Elder B. H. M——, a Baptist of Liberal principles, who resides in Athens County, Ohio, about forty miles from this, who writes as follows; viz.—

'"My constant employment is serving my generation as their servant for Christ's sake. I am engaged on a circuitous route. I have about thirty congregations to which I statedly minister. Notwithstanding the former prevalence of sectarian prejudice and superstition, yet Liberal Christianity is fast gaining ground. I fondly anticipate the time as not far distant, when the advocates for the unreasonable and unscriptural doctrines of tripersonality, eternal worship, infinite law, infinite sin, proxy sufferings, and eternal justification, &c. &c. will be few." This worthy young man is doing much good. Truth is mighty and will prevail.'

Progress of Liberal Opinions in Worcester County.—Were we to believe the Orthodox publications of the day, Unitarianism is fast approaching utter dissolution; certainly in Boston, if not throughout the State. Of Boston we will at present say nothing. The time we are told is fast coming in which there will not be a single Unitarian church in the metropolis, and for ourselves we had rather wait the event than prove false prophets. But we have before us a variety of evidence like the following, that, in the western parts of Massachusetts, a great change of a very different character is silently taking place, which perhaps a little exertion on the part of Unitarians would do much to accelerate and render complete. The letter we quote is from the town of ——, in Worcester County. 'Mr H— of N—, preached at ——, and some of the inhabitants of this town went over to hear him. It produced some excitement, and I found that there were from twenty to forty people among us, who were well disposed to receive Unitarian doctrines, and some of them already Unitarians; but most of them had never heard a Unitarian minister, nor read a Unitarian book, and only knew of the doctrine by hearsay. [Efforts were forthwith successfully made to form a society for the purchase of Unitarian tracts, and large numbers were distributed]. There are multitudes of people in this neighbourhood,' continues the writer, 'who would embrace Unitarianism, if they had the means of understanding it. Mr H. preaches with great effect, and if he were enabled to devote himself to a missionary tour for a few months more, would produce a surprising change. In the town of G——, formerly Calvinistic, the Unitarians have a considerable majority, I understand, but the means of hearing Unitarian preaching are almost entirely denied them. You may depend upon it that if proper exertions are made, an entire change in religious sentiments, may be produced in this neighbourhood. The people are very much alienated from Calvinism, but are generally silent and indifferent, as they know of no other doctrine.'

British and Foreign Unitarian Association.—The following is from a letter to the Secretary of the American, from the Secretary of the British and Foreign Association. 'In expressing a desire that our communications with our transatlantic brethren may in future be far more frequent than they have hitherto been, I not only convey the wishes of our Committee, but of the pub-

lic at large. It will be to us a subject of much congratulation if we are able to combine our plans with yours for the furtherance of christian truth; to cooperate in establishing links of a mightier chain of exertion, and by that union which is strength and success, be enabled to direct sincere and virtuous inquiry to those principles of faith and practice, which we consider as eminently representing the doctrines of the gospel.

'You will share our satisfaction at the now prosperous prospects in British India.

'We have been lately directing our attention to the state of Unitarianism among our Hungarian brethren. Some of their late inquiries have respected your churches, and in the situation of religious matters in the United States, they have expressed considerable interest. * * *

'In France religious inquiry seems slowly but undoubtedly awakening; and to an indifference to every thing that bore the coloring of polemics, great curiosity as to the distinction between christian sects has now succeeded.'

Unitarianism in Pennsylvania.—The course pointed out in the following extract from a letter from a clergyman of Pennsylvania, seems an excellent one in the emergency described, and might be adopted with advantage in other places. Indeed we know of several instances in which a similar plan has been pursued where the means of having regular Unitarian worship were denied, and in every case with manifestly good effect.

'I seize this opportunity to state more fully the arrangements which are made for promoting the Unitarian cause in N———. Some time before I left that neighbourhood, I succeeded in convincing my friends of the vast importance of maintaining regular worship on the Lord's day, both as it respected their respective families, and the general interest of the cause. They cheerfully entered into my plans of engaging a young man of unaffected piety, of good natural parts, and with an education which fits him for conducting an English school with considerable reputation, to take the lead in this good work. When I went to N———, he was a member of the Society of Methodists, but has since become a Unitarian, and is remarkably well acquainted with all the great points of controversy between us and other classes of Christians. They meet on the Lord's day morning. He reads a prayer from the Lutheran Liturgy, then a section from Kenrick's Commentary on the Four Gospels and the Acts, with the Reflections;—after singing, a printed sermon is read. I have heard that the congregation has generally attended, and approve of this method of supplying the want of a regular minister. I hope to be able to give them about twelve sabbaths in the year.

'I have pleasure in stating that this good practice is about to be followed by my friends in M———, where, I informed you in my last, they are about to build a church for Unitarian worship.

'It is my wish, if I can find suitable persons, to introduce this good practice in every place where I have been accustomed to preach regularly. This will keep our friends together, will preserve among them a spirit of devotion and inquiry, and will render my occasional visits more pleasant to myself, and more useful to them. In this way it is my wish that we should supply, as well as we are able, the want of regular ministers, which we now so sensibly feel, and which we shall much more sensibly feel ere long.'

Singular Revival.—The following extraordinary scene exhibits all the characteristics of a genuine revival, except, perhaps, that it was an evident outpouring of the Spirit in direct condemnation of the very measures which are commonly considered as the seals of a true work. We know not what to make of it. Upon all acknowledged principles of *revivalism* it is utterly inexplicable. Indeed, it to our minds completely annihilates all claims, in behalf of similar excitements, to be regarded as the work of God, instead of the results of human passion and delusion. It presents a case not decided or even contemplated by the notorious Convention which enlightened the world with such credit to itself at New Lebanon, and will certainly require another sitting of that dignified body. The account is taken from the 'Telescope,' a paper published, as we believe, in New York, and is as follows.

'I was a spectator at the Kehukee Association in Halifax county, North Carolina, on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of October, 1827, and beheld the proceedings of that Association in regard to the "De-

claration of the Reformed Baptist Churches." Last year, (1826), the Declaration was submitted to the inspection of the churches composing the Kehukee Association; and they were to signify in their letters to the Association, their reception or rejection of the whole or any part of the articles contained in that Declaration. When the Association met and proceeded to business, there was a motion made to refer it again to the churches another year, but it was objected to, and on being put to vote, it was decided by a large majority to receive the answer of the churches, in their letters, and they were read. If I mistake not, there were twenty churches unanimous in favor of adopting the Articles, and several other churches were in favor of all except the word *reform*. The Association is composed of thirtyeight churches, situated between the Roanoke and Tar rivers, and extends fromthe seashore for 150 miles up the country. The effect of the adoption of the articles was wonderful; for those that had been engaged on the side of missions, &c. after some debate, did, in many things, make their humble acknowledgments to their brethren, with tears, and begged their forgiveness, whose hearts were susceptible of feeling and forgiveness. These things were like an electric shock, spreading to all in the Council, about seventy persons. Nor did it stop here—for even their brethren standing round to hear, were so overcome with joy that they broke into the Association in their rapture—and all was love and tears, with kissing, shaking hands, embracing each other, confessing, forgiving, peace and fellowship, the like of which, though I am an old man, I have never seen before among Christians of any denomination. I was forced to turn aside and weep, and say to myself, God is here among this people of a truth, from the great love and joy which I saw among them.

'I do not think that if the greatest sticklers for modern missions and other schemes of the day, had witnessed this scene of love and affection, but that they must have confessed that God was in favor of the reformation from these practices, and acknowledged that such money collecting and pretended soul saving projects were anti-christian and injurious to the peace and prosperity of the kingdom of Christ, who out of the mouth of babes and sucklings perfects praise, instead of the flowery speeches and doings of the rich and great—and makes use of the weak things of the world to promote his cause on the earth, instead of learned Rabbies and pompous and hired missionaries, that no flesh may *glory in his presence*.

'At this time of divine visitation, for so it must be called, I heard the oldest minister in the Association say,—This is of God—for all the men in the world could not have produced such a change in the feelings and views of the Association as is now felt and enjoyed—nor have brought them so to see, eye to eye. The article on Missions was taken up for debate. After some explanation, the vote was taken and carried in favor of its adoption with scarce a dissenting voice. The joy that was felt on the occasion, tongue cannot express. Then Tract Societies, Bible Societies, and Theological Seminaries, were taken into consideration, and shared the same fate of disapprobation by the Association, with scarce a dissenting voice.

'Thus has terminated a most critical and important period in the affairs of the Association, by the rejection of those modern schemes and inventions of worldly wise men, who, like Simon Magus, think that the gift and favor of God may be purchased and extended by means of money. The Association hope never again to be annoyed and disturbed by these new invented and money getting schemes of men, nor by their runners and agents in their support, since they will be under a necessity to discountenance them as disturbers of the peace and union of the churches. The joy, union, and peace now spread over this tract of country, between ministers, churches, and people in general—in place of missionary schemes, strife, and contention, is the Lord's doings, through his instruments, to your and others' encouragement be it spoken. Go on—for the Lord has here signally shown that he is on your side, and will in the end prosper your labours, though in many places for a long time you will only be paid with the answer of a good conscience, reproaches and ill will. This is the reward you must expect from most for sending fire through the world to burn up the trash and stubble of men's inventions, which has been done to some extent in this part of the country; for it was said by the oldest minister in the Association, that at this time he did not know that there existed a

missionary society in North Carolina.—The resolutions are not given, as their import may be gathered from the narrative.

Orthodox Policy.—Will it be believed that the following paragraph is taken from the ablest and most respectable Orthodox print published in this country? a print, of course, which is issued under the surveillance of the leaders of the Orthodox party, and which is therefore to be supposed to countenance no measure for getting money, getting influence, or for getting anything else, in which that party is not committed, at least in so far as to approve of it? Yet such is the fact. The paragraph is from the Christian Observer published in New York. It is to shameless appeals like this that we must, in a great measure, attribute misguided conduct like that exhibited in oue preceding article of intelligence.

'TO THE BENEVOLENT.

'THERE is within two miles of this city a Presbyterian church and congregation in an infant and feeble state, but who have within a year and a half erected, and almost finished a sanctuary large enough to hold an audience of from 800 to 1000 persons. They have progressed so far that *five hundred dollars* will enable them to complete it, meet every engagement, and in three months to hold property unincumbered in the least, worth five thousand dollars. If any benevolent individual, or any three benevolent individuals, will bestow this charity, they shall have their names engraven on marble inlaid above the pulpit, as benefactors to the church, which shall remain so long as the society shall exist. A line left at this office, addressed to A. B. will lead to a satisfactory explanation on the part of said church and congregation.

'*New York, Nov.* 28, 1828.'

Who is not reminded by this of Pope's lines?—

'Who builds a church to God, and not to Fame,
Will never mark the marble with his name.'

New Church in Philadelphia.—We are happy to learn that the Unitarian Society of Philadelphia, under the care of the Rev. Mr Furness, has so increased that a larger house has become necessary for their accommodation. The old one has been taken down, and another is forthwith to be built on the same site.

Works of Rammohun Roy.—An edition of the writings of this extraordinary man, is to be published in a few days. It is matter of astonishment, and a proof of very uncommon powers, that a stranger and once a believer in another faith, should be able to write on a christian controversy with a power and a command of the subject which would be honorable to any the most thoroughly educated christian divine. We hope the volume forthcoming will receive the attention in this country which on every account it so well deserves.

Rammohun Roy.—'The character of this distinguished reformer having been, for obvious reasons, attacked by the "Orthodox" in the United States of America, the Unitarians there have rigorously examined every charge, and the result has only served to place the Hindoo Christian still higher in public estimation. In reply to the allegatiouf that this eminent man is no Christian, the following extract of a letter of his has been published, to which we are desirous of giving further publicity.

'" *Calcutta, Dec.* 28, 1824.

'"After I had been tired of the gross absurdities of the Hindoo doctrines, I directed my inquiries to the Christian faith (I mean the Trinitarian system of Christian faith, the name of *Unitarian* Christianity not then being known to me). But in proportion as I made myself acquainted with this system and its published defences and illustrations, my resolution increased to abandon it entirely, finding the Christian doctrines resemble those of Hindoos in substance, though they differ from each other in minute interpretations. I, however, was so fortunate as to become intimately acquainted with a Scotch gentleman of great acquirements, who kindly proposed to me to read the bible with him, and to examine whether it was more conformable to another system of Christianity called Unitarianism, and believed to have been the religion of primitive Christians. In following the advice of that best of all friends, I have felt thoroughly convinced that the Christianity which the majority of Christians profess is a mixed system of the Romish and Christian religions, and that pure Christianity has its support both from revelation and from the human understanding; a circumstance which not only has happily deterred me from manifesting hostile feelings towards

this religion, but has rendered it incumbent upon me to exert myself in extending its influence by every possible means. I hope I shall at a future period lay before the public a statement showing the close resemblance existing between the doctrines maintained by Hindoos and the majority of Christians." '—*Christian Reformer.*

Unitarian Advocate.—Two numbers of a monthly periodical with this title, have been published under the editorial care of the Rev. Edmund Q. Sewall. That gentleman is already favorably known to the public as a writer, and the work he is now conducting is well received and liberally patronised. It promises to be a very useful and an able support to the Unitarian cause.

American Journal of Education. This very valuable work, still under the editorial care of Mr Russell, has lately changed proprietors, and efforts have been made to extend its circulation and to increase its value. It has been greatly improved in many respects, and especially by connecting with it the Teacher's Guide and Parent's Assistant, formerly published in Gilmanton, N. H. It is certainly one of the most important and interesting periodicals published in this country, and the talent with which it is conducted deserves to be well supported.

Kenrick's Exposition.—Messrs Monroe & Francis, of Boston, have issued proposals for publishing this work by subscription. A Unitarian commentary on the scriptures is certainly a great desideratum, and perhaps Kenrick's, which, however, extends to the historical books of the New Testament only, is the best that can at present be had. Still it is in different parts very defective and very redundant. We hope the publishers will engage some suitable person to revise and abridge it, before it is put to press. They will then be entitled to the thanks of the friends of free inquiry and rational religion throughout the country.

Little's Sermons.—Mr James Kay of Philadelphia, has issued proposals for publishing by subscription, a volume of sermons by the late Rev. William Little, of Washington, D. C. The profits of the work are intended for the benefit of his family. The volume will be a very valuable one, if we may judge from the character of several discourses of Mr Little's already published, and we sincerely hope the enterprise will be generally patronised by the Unitarian community.

Ordination at Littleton.—Mr William W. White, from the Theological School at Cambridge, was, on Wednesday, Jan. 2d, ordained as pastor of the Congregational Society in Littleton. Introductory Prayer by Rev. Mr Lincoln of Fitchburg; Selections from the Bible by Rev. Mr Robinson of Groton; Sermon by Rev. Dr Thayer of Lancaster; Consecrating Prayer by Rev. Dr Kendall of Plymouth; Charge by Rev. Dr Lowell of Boston; Fellowship of the Churches by Rev. Mr Stetson of Medford; Address to the people by Rev. Mr Allen of Bolton; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr Osgood of Sterling.

Ordination at Northfield.—On Wednesday, Feb. 27th, Mr Samuel Presbury was ordained pastor of the Second Congregational Society in Northfield. Introductory Prayer and Reading of the Scriptures by Rev. Mr Lincoln of Fitchburg; Sermon by Rev. Mr Pierpont of Boston; Ordaining Prayer by Rev. Mr Rodgers of Bernardston; Charge by Rev. Mr Bailey of Greenfield; Right Hand of Fellowship by Rev. Mr Gage of Nashua Village, N. H.; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr Hall of Northampton.

Dedication in Boston.—The South Congregational Church in Boston was dedicated to the worship of the only God, on Wednesday, Jan. 30th. Introductory Prayer by Rev. Mr Young; Selections from Scripture by Rev. Mr Frothingham; Dedicatory Prayer by Rev. Mr Pierpont; Sermon by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr Gannett.

Dedication at Newton Upper Falls. A meetinghouse recently erected at this place, was on Wednesday, Feb. 27th, dedicated to the One God, with appropriate religious services. Introductory Prayer by Rev. Mr Francis of Watertown; Selection from the Scriptures by Rev. Mr Kimball; Dedicatory Prayer by Rev. Mr White of Dedham; Sermon by Rev. Mr Ritchie of Needham; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr Ripley of Waltham.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE period that has elapsed since the peace of 1815, has been as remarkable for the repose which has been enjoyed, by most of the nations of Europe, as that which preceded it was, for the desolating wars and sweeping revolutions in which those nations were involved. The history of this period however, is hardly less worthy of being studied, and the events of it, though less brilliant, and farther removed from observation, are producing important effects, not only on the welfare of the present generation, but on the destiny of nations in future ages. It is therefore important to take notice of these events, that we may learn from them something of the prospects of the future, as well as endeavour to reap from them some benefit to ourselves.

It is not our purpose to attempt a review of this interesting period of history, nor even a regular narrative of passing events. Our design is merely to place before the reader a record of a few of the most prominent transactions of the day, interspersed sometimes with such remarks as may seem appropriate to the occasion. This will be done in the most cursory manner, as the space which we can devote to this object will be extremely limited. The present article will be confined to a mere enumeration of some of the most prominent political events which have come to our knowledge within the last few weeks.

GREAT BRITAIN. The ministry formed on the death of Mr Canning, under Lord Goderich, which embraced several prominent individuals who had been long in the ranks of the opposition, met with irreconcilable difficulties, and early in January Lord Goderich offered his resignation. The Duke of Wellington was commissioned by the king to form a new cabinet. This commission he executed, by excluding all the whigs, and under the new administration. Parliament met on the 29th of January. It is understood that the new ministry is opposed to the Catholic claims. The state of the kingdom is not unprosperous. Trade is gradually reviving. The produce of the revenue of the kingdom, for the last year, presents a small increase over that of the year preceding.

FRANCE. In France some remarkable changes have lately taken place in the government. The ministry, at the head of which was the Count de Villele, had by a number of acts of doubtful expediency, become extremely unpopular, and although they were supported by a decided majority in the Chamber of Deputies, they had been outvoted in some favorite measures in the Chamber of Peers. To secure an ascendency in this body, the extraordinary measure of creating a large number of new Peers was resorted to, and about the same time the Chamber of Deputies, for reasons not fully understood, was dissolved, and a new election was ordered. This Chamber would not have expired, by the limitation of the charter, for three years, the duration of the Chamber, after each election, unless dissolved by the royal authority, being seven years. It has been supposed that the dissolution was advised by the ministers, because they thought the chance of a new Chamber, which should be favorable to their views, would be better now, in an election brought forward so suddenly as to give little opportunity to the opposition to organzie their strength, than at the legal expiration of the Chamber. The election however, contrary to the general expectation, resulted in the choice of a large majority of members known to be opposed to the ministers, though many of them attached to parties heretofore strongly opposed to one another. In this state of things, before the assembling of the Chambers, the ministers resigned, and on the 5th of January a royal ordonnance announced the appointment of a new ministry. A majority of the new cabinet however, are known to have been friends and supporters of the old, and whether they will be able to command the confidence and support of the Chamber of Deputies, remains to be seen. M.de Villele,and two of his colleagues have been raised to the peerage, which creations, with those announced a few weeks before, make seventynine new members, added to the Chamber of Peers. France has become involved in a war with the Dey of Algiers, and has blockaded the port of Algiers.

SPAIN, though the insurrection in

that country is by no means suppressed, appears to be in a more quiet state than it was a few months ago. The king and queen have been several months absent from the capital on an excursion undertaken for pacifying their subjects in the eastern part of the kingdom, and at the last accounts they were at Barcelona, where they proposed to remain until April. The whole kingdom is in a wretchedly disordered state, from the imbecility of the government, the ignorance and fanaticism of a great portion of the people, and the violence of the contending parties. It is positively asserted in the late French papers that the French troops, with the exception of the garrison of Cadiz, were about to be withdrawn from the kingdom.

PORTUGAL. The kingdom of Portugal has been for some time in an unsettled state from the violence of party feeling for and against the constitution. The constitutional party at present maintains the ascendency. The crown on the decease of the late king, devolved by the laws of the kingdom, upon his eldest son, the emperor of Brazil. He saw fit to relinquish it in favor of his daughter, a child of eight or nine years of age. Between this daughter, the young queen, and Don Miguel her uncle, the second son of the late king, a contract of marriage has been entered into, with the consent of her father. Don Miguel, in the lifetime of his father, showed himself a man of uncontrollable passions, and apparently a very unfit person to be entrusted with the administration of a government. He endeavoured to place himself at the head of the absolute party, and to seize the reins of government before his father's death. He was defeated in his designs, and to place him out of the way of other intrigues he was sent abroad on his travels. He has been residing some time at the court of the emperor of Austria, where, after some hesitation, he consented to swear to the constitution, by which a representative government is secured to the people of Portugal, and the power of the crown is put under salutary restrictions. He is now on his return to Portugal, and at the date of the last intelligence from Europe, he was in England, whence he was to embark in a short time for Lisbon. The government, in the mean time, has been administered since the death of the late king, by the princess Isabella Maria, the sister of Don Pedro, emperor of Brazil, and of Don Miguel, as Regent. To this Regency Don Miguel is to succeed, on his arrival in Portugal, and will be virtually the king of Portugal, in the right of his future wife, Donna Maria Gloria, if that alliance should take place in fact. Of this there is some reason to doubt, as the latest advices from Rio Janeiro have brought the intelligence that the young queen was dangerously ill of a bilious fever, and not expected to survive many hours. In the event of her death, it is not easy to foresee what will be the course of succession.

RUSSIA. The latest intelligence from Russia informs us of the termination of the war with Persia. By this peace, Russia gains, as is usual with her in all treaties of peace with the neighbouring states, a new accession of territory. The war began in the invasion of the territory formerly ceded to Russia, by a body of Persian troops. It ends by a cession to Russia of the Khanates of Nakhitchenard and Erivan, bounded principally by the river Araxes. The Schah of Persia also stipulates to pay a heavy pecuniary indemnity for the expenses of the war, a part to be paid on the signature of the treaty of peace, and the remainder at short intervals after.

TURKEY. The affairs of Turkey, which have for a long time engaged the public attention, wear some appearance of approaching a crisis. The Turkish government, after protracting as long as possible the negotiations with the ambassadors of Great Britain, France, and Russia, finally rejected the proposition, made under the treaty of July 6, 1827, and the ambassadors demanded their passports. These were refused by the Turkish government, but the ambassadors withdrew from Constantinople, without molestation, on the 8th of December, and set out for their respective countries. No measures had been adopted, at the date of the last accounts, in consequence of this rupture of the negotiation, but it was understood that the Grand Seignior was making preparations for hostilities, with as much activity as possible, and that a large Russian army was stationed on the Pruth, which is the boundary of that country on the side of Turkey. Whether hostilities were likely to ensue, was left to conjecture. There is nothing in the treaty of July 6, that necessarily implies that the parties to it

would take an active part in the war, in a contingency like that which is now presented. But the promptness with which they enforced, by the battle of Navarino, the measures which they had agreed upon, shows that they will not be backward in resorting to force, if they find it necessary for effecting the object which they have in view, the pacification of Greece. It is perhaps probable, that they will confine themselves, for the present at least, to preventing the sending of reinforcements by sea, and the establishment of commercial relations with the Greeks, as this course appears to be particularly pointed out in the treaty above alluded to; yet there are some reasons for believing, that a Russian army will immediately enter the principalities, and perhaps march directly to the Turkish capital. A Russian army might in a short time cross the Danube, and with such a force as will probably be brought into the field, if this step is resorted to, there is little reason to doubt, that it might march, in spite of the resistance which it would be in the power of the sultan to interpose, directly to the gates of Constantinople. Should such be the result of the measures to which the obstinacy of the Porte may have compelled the allies to resort, it will then be manifestly in their power to dictate the terms of peace—a peace called for by the claims of humanity, and by the interests of all the commercial nations of Europe.

GREECE. From Greece there has been no recent intelligence of moment, except that of a gallant naval action in the Gulf of Lepanto, in which seven Turkish vessels were destroyed, and of the landing of two thousand Greeks in the island of Scio, and the conquest of the whole of that island, with the exception of the fortresses in the harbour, which at the last accounts remained in the hands of the Turks. It has been reported that the Greek vessels, employed in blockading these forts, had been destroyed by the French squadron, in pursuance of the design of the allied fleet, to enforce an armistice between the parties; but this report is not confirmed. It has also been reported that Ibrahim Pacha had withdrawn the Egyptian troops to the neighbourhood of Modon, and that in consequence Patras had been compelled to surrender to the Greeks. The Greeks were expecting with impatience the arrival of the Count Capo D'Istria, a native of Greece, of distinguished character, who has been, for many years, in high and responsible employment in the service of Russia, and who has been appointed president of the Grecian Republic, for the term of seven years, with extraordinary powers. Since his appointment he has visited the capitals of Russia, Great Britain, and France, and he left the latter country several months since for Greece, it is supposed with the approbation of the three governments, and in possession of considerable resources for giving efficiency to the measures of his administration. The Greeks of all parties, place great confidence in him, and look forward to his arrival as the signal for the restoration of order and subordination in the country. It is to be hoped that these expectations may be realized, and that he may succeed in his patriotic design, of bestowing on his countrymen the blessings of liberty, regulated by laws.

SOUTH AMERICA. The infant nations of our own continent have been far from enjoying that tranquillity to which they might have looked forward, as the reward of their labors and sacrifices, in establishing their independence. In Mexico, an open rebellion of a formidable character, was suppressed by the vigor of the government, in January last, and General Bravo, the Vice President, with a number of other distinguished individuals were made prisoners. The government had previously adopted the harsh and injudicious measure of expelling from the country all persons who were natives of Spain. The finances of this country are at rather a low ebb, and the government have been so improvident as to suffer the dividend due on a large loan contracted in London, to remain unprovided for, and consequently unpaid. A Mexican brig of war, the Guerrero, was lately captured by a Spanish frigate, after a long and severe action, in which the captain, Porter, a nephew of commodore Porter, and fortynine men were killed.

Central America has been long in a state of lamentable disorder, and at the date of the last accounts from that country, the inhabitants were in arms against one another, the President of the republic being at the head of one army, and the Vice President, of another. Colombia also continued in a disordered state, and the return of the Liberator, Bolivar,

had not been attended with the effect of restoring quiet and confidence. A congress is now in session at Ocana, engaged in the attempt to reconcile the difficulties that have long agitated the country. The finances are in an impoverished state, and insufficient either for maintaining the credit of the government abroad or supplying its wants at home. Arbitrary expedients have been resorted to in some of the seaports for supplying the deficiency, which have had an injurious effect on the foreign trade. In Peru, Chili, and Buenos Ayres, important changes in the government have been made, the particulars of which we must pass over. Buenos Ayres, besides having suffered the inconvenience of an entire change in her government, is in a state of war with the emperor of Brazil, and the port of Buenos Ayres has been blockaded by a Brazilian squadron for many months. The blockade however is not very strictly enforced, and the vessels of this country frequently succeed in entering it with supplies. The war is extremely onerous to Brazil, and although carried on at great expense by the imperial government, it is prosecuted with little vigor or success.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Very few events have lately occurred in our domestic history, of sufficient importance to be here noticed. In Congress, no measures of any importance, with the exception of the annual appropriation bills, has yet been adopted, or discussed. A great number of subjects of legislation have been presented to the attention of Congress, and referred to committees. The two which have excited the greatest interest, and which will probably be brought into serious debate, are a proposition to grant some indemnity to the surviving officers of the revolution, for their pecuniary sacrifices, and one to increase the tariff of duties on the import of certain classes of foreign manufactures, for the purpose of encouraging the manufacture of those goods in this country. The subject of a political nature, which engages most of the public attention, is that of the next election of President. The question whether Mr Adams shall be again elected, or whether Gen. Jackson shall be chosen in his place, is one on which the public opinion is divided, and which gives a direction to the debates on almost all subjects which are brought before Congress. Unfortunately the decision is likely to be very little influenced by any careful consideration of the personal fitness, or unfitness, of the respective candidates.

One of the subjects alluded to by the President, in his Message on the opening of the session of Congress, was the negotiation with the British government for an adjustment of the boundary between the state of Maine and the province of New Brunswick. A statement of the question had been agreed on, for the purpose of referring it to the arbitration of a friendly government. It has since been announced that the government resorted to, as the umpire in the case, is that of Russia. Our government claims, as a part of Maine, in conformity with what appear to us to be the obvious terms of the treaty of 1783, and also in conformity with the known limits of the province of Massachusetts Bay, (then including Maine Nova Scotia and Quebec), as those limits were established, and clearly defined by acts of the British crown as early as 1763, the whole territory bounded, east by a line running from the source of the St Croix river, due north, crossing the St John, and terminated by the highlands between this last named river and the St Lawrence, and north by the highland, which divide the waters of the St John, from those of the St Lawrence. The British government maintains, that the due north line from the St Croix should terminate at the highlands south of the St John, and that the northern boundary of Maine should follow the course of the highlands, which divide the waters of the Penobscot, from those of the St John. They consequently claim the territory watered by the St John and its branches, as belonging to the British provinces. There is now a population of about two thousand souls on the disputed territory, consisting of persons who have seated themselves there without any title to the lands which they occupy, from either government. Over this population the government of New Brunswick has recently undertaken to exercise a right of jurisdiction, and this claim has given rise to a controversy of rather an angry character, which has produced a high degree of excitement between the parties more immediately interested, and which it is difficult to adjust, until the question of right shall be determined, which has been referred to a foreign tribunal.

OBITUARY.

DIED, at New York, January 21, Mrs GRACE WEBSTER, wife of the Hon. Daniel Webster of Boston. She had accompanied her husband as far as New York in November last, who was on his way to Washington for the purpose of taking his seat in the Senate of the United States. On her arrival in New York, a chronic disease, from which she had suffered severely for several months, became so alarming and painful, that she was compelled to desist from the further prosecution of the journey. She remained at the house of a friend, Dr Cyrus Perkins, where her disease became gradually more severe, until she at length sunk under it, and yielded up her life, in humble resignation to the will of her Maker. The character of Mrs Webster, calls for some public testimonial, both from its intrinsic excellence, fitted as it was to be held up as a pattern of those graces which adorn the christian character, and from regard to the many friends who, in the intercourse of society, and the various relations of life, have had the happiness of being the witnesses of her uncommon worth.

She was from early life a religious woman, strongly impressed with the duties of piety, and the obligations of living are ligious life; of respecting the institutions of religion, and of giving a religious education to her children. In conformity with her sense of these obligations, she discharged her various domestic and social duties, and regulated her employments, and her intercourse with society. To the duties of benevolence she was peculiarly sensible, and they were always discharged by her with pleasure. Very many persons will long remember with gratitude the acts of disinterested kindness, by which she has relieved their sufferings, supplied their wants, or removed their embarrassments. Her manners were remarkable for simplicity and propriety, springing less from study and observation, than from a natural sense of what would be agreeable to those around her, and at the same time what was due to herself. She was therefore the ornament of the social circle, and it was her fortune to conciliate the friendship of very many, with whom her situation in life had brought her acquainted. To those who enjoyed the privilege of an intimate acquaintance with her, she was peculiarly dear, from the sweetness of her disposition, the steadiness of her attachments, and the skill with which she contributed to the gratification of her friends. With a sound understanding, and a mind well instructed, with fortitude to endure adversity, and discernment to turn prosperity to its noblest uses—the good of those about her—with diligence and prudence in the conduct of the affairs which devolved upon her, she was enabled to sustain the trials to which it had pleased God to subject her, and to discharge in the most exemplary manner the duties she owed to her family, her friends, and to society. The afflictions and bereavements which she was called to suffer, did not destroy the serenity and cheerfulness of her disposition, and the sufferings of her last long and painful sickness, were endured by her with patience, and without complaint. During the whole of her sickness, she was apprized of the danger of her situation, but she contemplated the prospect of its fatal termination with serenity. Though she had much to live for, and though she loved the world as the workmanship of God, and as full of a thousand beauties of his creation, her prevailing feeling in the prospect of death, was that of submission to the will of her heavenly Father. She had been for several years a member of the church in Brattle Street, and some of her last words were expressions of affectionate recollection of her esteemed pastor, and of regret that she had been deprived of his friendly counsels. Her remains were brought to Boston, and were deposited with those of two of her children, who had gone before her.

ERRATA.

Page 43, line 23 from top, and line 2 of note †, for 'Schoeltgen', read 'Schoettgen'.
" 48, line 16 from bottom, for 'that is, a member' read 'that is, as a member'.
" 52, line 2 from bottom, for 'has', read 'says'.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—No. II.

MARCH AND APRIL, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

ON CLERICAL DUTIES; AND PARTICULARLY ON SOME MISAPPREHENSIONS OF THEIR IMPORTANCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—The anniversary of my ordination has again drawn my attention to the subject of clerical duties; and if you are not weary of the subject, and can answer as much for your readers, I shall beg leave again to occupy a few of your pages, with my reflections upon it. You will agree with me, I think, that no subject can be more practical. For if the ministry of the gospel is designed to exert any influence, it must exert that influence very much through the views that are entertained of its duties; it must especially in this country, where the mass of the people are withdrawing the blind reverence, which has formerly been paid to the ministry, and are instituting a very strict inquiry into its offices and labors. Since, therefore, these duties are not only matters of common interest, but of constant discussion, a clergyman certainly will not subject himself to the charge of egotism, by bringing forward, and endeavouring again and again to present, just and useful views of them.

Let me, then, beg permission of your readers to recall to their attention some of the views which I have stated to them in former communications. I have pointed out some misapprehensions of the connexion between the clergy and people; and particularly that of regarding their interests and objects as dis-

tinct and different. As the connexion is, in fact, one of common interest; as there is, truly, a mutual and a mutually useful compact between the parties, I have protested against the injurious charge, and I must say, in this country, the absurd charge of a 'mercenary spirit' in the clergy. I have maintained, also, that in the community of interests which exists in this relation, clergymen should be less thought of personally, and that their usefulness should be more regarded; that they should be less thought of as favorite, or disagreeable preachers; that there should be less anxiety about their preaching what are called 'fine sermons,' that is, sermons creditable to themselves; in short, that less regard should be had to the man, and more to the matter. I am sorry, sir, to observe how little the public taste indicates of the feeling of reality about religion. For I do not find that where property is at stake, as in our courts of justice, or where a real interest of the community is involved, as in legislation,—I do not find, I say, that there is such an anxiety to have *fine* speeches *there;* nor is there such a perpetual demand made, in those cases, to be delighted or aroused. No; people are already aroused and awakened, in such circumstances; and what they want, is, to be informed, to have clear and substantial convictions impressed upon their minds, to have something said upon which they can act. Pretty commonplaces do not suffice for them; nor original thoughts, fit only to be admired. It does not satisfy them, that they have had a fine speech, if they have gained no new conviction or impression from it. In short they are thinking more of the matter, and less of the man. I have also said, that it would be a great benefit, if our religious services possessed more of this deliberative character, more of the character of a meditation; if our preachers were considered as speaking more from the sense of real and common interests; if they were considered less as fulfilling an assigned part in some artificial arrangement between them and the people, and more as taking part with them, in the common interests, fears, and sorrows of human life.

The next subject connected with the ministry, to which I have invited the attention of your readers, is that of clerical labors. I have shown that, from the demands of the age, these labors are unusually great, and that in the Unitarian body, from its relative situation, and also from the state of mind prevailing in it, these demands are greater than anywhere else; that they are, in fact, unexampled in the whole history of the sacred office. And from this fact, and from the actually declining health of an unexampled proportion of our clergy, I have derived an argument for a candid consideration of their labors.

I am, now, sir, about to enter a little more into the interior of clerical duties; or, to speak more exactly, I am about to enter into some consideration of the views which are commonly entertained of them. And adhering still to my plan of teaching the true, by pointing out the erroneous views, I intend to dwell upon what I conceive to be some misapprehensions of these duties, and, I will add, of the whole conduct of a clergyman; to dwell, I might say, upon a single misapprehension; for I believe that the old maxim of 'one thing at a time,' is as useful in morals as in business.

I say, then, that there is *a factitious importance ascribed to the official duties and to the whole conduct of a clergyman.* I say, that in certain respects, too much is made of what he does, whether officially or otherwise. Justly considered, I do not think his duties are overrated; I do not think they well can be. But there is an unnatural importance, an artificial value ascribed to them. They occupy a place in the means of religion, which they were never intended to occupy; not a greater place, properly speaking, but a different place, and it is in this false position, that they are greatly and injuriously overrated. The people take them to be of more consequence than they are; not absolutely, but relatively of more consequence. They conceive that the clerical duties, on the bare performance, are more to *them*, than they actually are; more, because they are official acts, and more than any merely official acts can be in the intimate and spiritual concerns of religion.

If my meaning is not fully taken, I trust it will be made plain, by a few remarks on the different portions of a clergyman's duty and conduct.

And first, let us look at the public department, at the offices which he sustains in public worship. It is the duty of the minister to *pray*. Now, I say, that the importance of this duty, in a just view of it, can scarcely be overestimated. If he offers the fervent prayer; if the whole congregation unites with him; if all their hearts in this thing are as the heart of one man; if devoted prayer ascends from the whole assembly as the incense of old, how beautiful is the offering! how excellent is the sacrifice! and how high and blessed is the office of leading such devotions as these! But I cannot resist the conviction, that to the eye of the heart searching God, such a spectacle of united and entire devotion is seldom or never presented in our sanctuaries. There are too many, who, with minds negligent and wandering, seem to expect that the prayer of the clergyman will pass to their account, whether they take any part in it or not. And is

there not, in fact, some delusion of this nature?—for to this point my observations tend. It is the duty of the minister to pray; that is his business; that is the part assigned to him. Now it is, in truth, just as much the duty of every other individual who enters the sanctuary, to pray. But does every individual feel this? Or does he not the less feel it, or does he not the less feel his deficiency, because the solemn formality of prayer is used by another? Suppose that, according to the custom of our congregations, there were no audible prayer, but only a space given for every one to make his silent offerings; or suppose that the clergyman might occasionally take this liberty—and who has not, at times, so felt the overpowering sense of a present Divinity, that he would fain, when he rose to prayer, have kneeled down in silence and worshipped? In either of these cases, I say, would not many be shaken from that vague reliance, which they now feel, on the prayers of their minister? Would they not be aroused themselves to pray? Or, if not so aroused, would they not at least distinctly feel, that they had had no part nor lot in this service? Would they not feel that it had been nothing to them whatever, or nothing but a reproach on their lukewarm and worldly minds? But now, they say, the case being as it is, 'We have been at church'—'We have attended divine service'—'We have had prayers.' They feel that they have been embraced in the visible solemnities of devotion; they feel as if they had taken part in public worship, and as if the prayers which they have only heard, were prayers that they had offered. They say, 'We have been at church,' when, so far as real devotion is concerned, they might as well have been anywhere else; 'We have attended divine service,' but they have not attended *to* it; 'We have had prayers,' but they have made no prayers.

This, then, is one of the respects in which a factitious importance is given to the duties of a clergyman; in which his acts pass, not for more than they are intrinsically worth, but for infinitely more than they are worth to him who considers them as a kind of substitute for his own acts. And how lamentable is it! His wants, his infirmities, his dangers are as great and pressing as those of any other man. His soul is perishing for lack of heavenly food, and it is perishing in the midst of a feast. Yes, and he acts as absurdly as would that man, who should consider it sufficient to assuage his own hunger, that the master of the feast partook.

Let us pass, now, to another part of the public services of religion. It is the duty of the clergyman to *preach*; but not a

whit more than it is the duty of others to hear; not a whit more than it is the duty of others to profit by his preaching. Yet there are many who never seriously think of being profited—who never think of going to church for that purpose; and there are some who regularly take their place in church only to resign themselves to sleep; and there are some who do better than that, it must be confessed—who stay away from church half of the time, without any good reason for their absence. But would these persons have the institution of public worship *generally* neglected, or dishonored, or misimproved, in this manner? 'By no means; by no means whatever. Why—what!' they will say, 'no public worship? no preaching? no sabbath? 'It would be dreadful. We should feel as if we were scarcely Christians, if it were so. We should be no better than Heathens.' And what is it, I pray, that makes these persons, those who neglect public worship just when it suits their indolence or their love of indulgence, and those who hear the word, but never profit by it—what is it that makes them Christians in their own account? what is it that makes them easier in mind, under their neglects and deficiencies? what is it that saves them from being 'Heathens?' a word which their superficial and mechanical notions of religion have contrived to render odious. Why, it is, that there are a priesthood and a sabbath; that there are preaching and public worship. I say, then, are not the public functions of a clergyman exalted into an artificial consequence? Are they not made to occupy a place in such men's religion, which they never ought to occupy? Are such negligent 'hearers of the word' just before God? No; 'but the doers of the word shall be justified.' Are those who 'hear the word, but do not,' any better for hearing? No better; and it may be that they are worse; it is probable that they are more guilty. And yet they imagine themselves to be better and safer, because they are hearers. They are like those of whom it is represented, that they shall say, 'Lord, Lord, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets;' but of whom the Lord shall say, 'I know you not; depart from me all ye workers of iniquity'—ye hearers, but not doers of the word; ye hearers of the righteous law, but ye workers of unrighteous deeds.

But it will be said, Mr Editor, 'Had not these persons better go to church nevertheless, and is it not best that they should *hear*, at any rate?' That, sir, is not the point. Admit, that it *is* best, that they should continue their attendance. How much better would it be, that they should attend with just views!

How injurious is it, that they should devolve upon another, in any degree, that work of religion, which they must do for themselves! How unfortunate is it, that so many in our sanctuaries should be left to imagine that they have nothing to do but to hear; nothing to do but to resign themselves to the passive impressions of the place; nothing to do but to revel in the luxuries of a transient feeling and excitement! And how much worse than all is it, that they should then think they have done well!

What if every exhortation of the sanctuary should close with recommending some specific action to be performed, and should insist that the hearing was to no purpose unless this was done. Suppose that the action recommended were the forgiveness of an enemy, or a charity, or a visit to the sick, and that every hearer should feel that unless this was done, the exhortation had altogether failed of its purpose; that he might as well not have heard it. But there is a moral consequence, which ought to follow every exhortation as truly as if it were a specific action; and unless this follows, it is just as true that the exhortation is in vain, and the hearing is in vain, and the faith vain; men are yet in their sins. I fear, indeed, that our congregations have much to learn before they will truly experience and practically understand what it is to be doers of the word.

On the public ministrations of a clergyman, I will detain you, sir, but a moment longer. I wish to say a word or two, of the *benediction*. I have often apprehended, that the office of the minister, when he thus closes the service, is liable to have more attributed than belongs to it. It is commonly called, 'giving the blessing' to the congregation, and from the solemn attitude and manner of the minister, superstition might gather the impression, that he was really conferring a blessing upon the people. I think it worth while to say, therefore, by way of explanation to any who need it, that in this act the clergyman simply expresses his affectionate and devout wishes for the religious welfare of his hearers. He desires that 'grace, mercy, and peace, from God, the Father of all blessings, and from Jesus Christ, as the great teacher and messenger of mercy and peace, may be upon the people; that all the graces and joys of piety springing from the blessing of God, and from the instructions of Jesus, may be multiplied to them forever.' Thus regarded, this may appear as a very appropriate, natural, and beautiful close of public worship.

Let us now, sir, follow the clergyman from his public ministrations, to his *deportment and duties in society*.

I will pause a moment upon his deportment. And I will ask why it is, or at least, for what good reason it is, that different manners should be required of him, or different rules of behaviour should be imposed on him, from those which govern other men? The question, of course, does not relate to things that are wrong, but to things in themselves indifferent. And I ask, again, why in these things, such a factitious importance should be given to every action and word, and look of a clergyman; why, in these things, he should not be left to the same liberty, that other men enjoy? Let me not be told that these notions are done away. They are not done away. How often is a clergyman looked upon with surprise, and spoken of with censorious misgivings, for doing the most innocent things in the world; and things that, in the simplicity of his mind, he never thought of as proper or improper. How often is it said, 'This thing would be well enough, it is true, for another man, but we are surprised that a clergyman should do it.'

It is unpleasant to go into details on such a subject as this, and every one's reflections, perhaps, will supply him with sufficient illustration. Nor is it a matter that I am concerned to speak of with any earnestness. Least of all would I recommend, in the present state of public opinion, that clergymen should disregard those restraints that are laid upon them. I am aware, too, that in the purest state of the public taste, there would naturally be some restraints, even in things innocent. Nevertheless, as the case now stands, I am persuaded that there is much that is puerile and childish in the common judgment of these matters. And I submit it to the wisdom of a liberal community, whether men had not better take a little more care of their own tempers, and a little less of such innocent and indifferent things as the constitutional temperaments and manners of another. A man worn out with study, and bowed down with the weight of serious, and often mournful duties, ought not to have his moments of relaxation too narrowly watched. And I am afraid that censoriousness may appear to be a worse thing at the last, than all the innocent hilarity in the world. Besides, I cannot but think it actually injurious, that questions of right and wrong, should be mixed up with so many extrinsic and artificial considerations; that that should be right under one garb which is not right under another; that that should be wrong in a clergyman, which is not wrong in any other man. It is of some consequence that men should be reminded that right and wrong are unchangeable and eternal attributes, not to take their character from our titles, or their complexion from our garments. I scarcely think it too much to say, that the moral sense of the community is let down

by these technical and superficial judgments. It is injurious to a man's moral discrimination to say, 'This is right for me, but for you, who are a minister or a member of the church, it would be a heinous sin.' For myself, I must say, that although I would respect, in my conduct, the very prejudices of society, I would by no means submit my mind to these trammels of a worldly, not to say a puerile and childish morality. I would indeed take the counsel of Paul, that 'all things are not expedient for me;' but then I would exercise the same fearless judgment, that 'all things,' that is, all things that are innocent, 'are lawful for me.'

But let us proceed, sir, to more important matters; to the official duties that a minister is to perform in society. You will understand, of course, that I refer to *parochial visiting*, both upon ordinary and extraordinary occasions.

And first, the ordinary visits or *calls* which a clergyman, as such, is expected to make. There is a great, and as I have formerly said, there is at this day, an unprecedented demand in society for visits of this nature; a demand, indeed, which few clergymen have any ability to meet. Now I may be expected very freely to admit, that this demand, to a certain extent, is very natural and proper. It is very natural, certainly, that he who addresses his fellow beings on the most interesting of all subjects, and who is often with them in the most interesting of all circumstances, should be an object of interest to them; that they should desire an acquaintance with him; that they should ask for his society. But over and above this natural and reasonable feeling, I say that there is a factitious feeling; and it is this, which it is so painful to encounter. There is a desire to see the clergyman, not simply as an interesting, intelligent, and religious friend, but to see him because he is 'the clergyman.' There is a desire, springing, not from religious anxiety, not from the real want or love of religious intercourse—that, it would be delightful to meet—but a desire springing from the love of notice, from jealousy, and, I might almost say, from anger. People complain, often, not because their souls are not cared for, but because their vanity is not gratified. Their wish for the society of their minister is not an affectionate request, but an impatient and peevish demand. I say, again, that with many persons, this is not a religious feeling. It is, too often, a very different feeling. And where it is truly social and kind, as it is, no doubt, in most cases, still it is, many times, very factitious and unreasonable; factitious, for why should the conversation of a clergyman be so much more valuable, than the con-

versation of any other intelligent friend?—unreasonable, because no man with the duties of the sacred office pressing upon him, no man who studies hard, who faithfully prepares himself for the pulpit, and who pays proper attention to the sick and afflicted, can possibly visit often enough to satisfy this feeling;—factitious and unreasonable too, on another account; for on every sabbath, the clergyman is unfolding his mind to the people, giving his views of religion to them, communing with their minds, if they will allow him, answering, as far as he is able, the religious inquiries that arise among them, and, in short, doing that, mostly, which they might desire to have done in a private interview.

I do not say these things, sir, because I would depreciate parochial duties. I value them as highly as any other man. I wish it were possible for me and my brethren, to visit a great deal more than we do. But it is not possible. There must be some consideration among the people. The health of our clergy is everywhere failing, with their present and actual labors; and it is all nonsense to talk about parochial duties as a *relaxation.*

I say these things, then, for two reasons. I say them, that the people may consider—that they may consider their own feelings, and how far those feelings ought to be gratified. I say them, too, because it is painful to live with society on the terms that we do; because it is painful, when we would make a friendly call, to have it so often said to us; 'What a stranger you are!' and, 'It is so long, or so long a time since you have been here.' If the people do not think that we take an interest in their daily and their best welfare—yes, and a very deep and tender interest, they ought to dismiss us; and we should be very justly discarded as men of extraordinary obduracy. For how is it possible for a man to be, throughout every week, anxiously and laboriously engaged in thoughts and meditations for enlightening and guiding his fellow men on the most momentous and affecting of all concerns—how is it possible that he should not feel the most unfeigned and unspeakable interest for their welfare! How many of our brethren have offered and are offering their health and life a sacrifice on the altar of their professional duty; and shall they be accused of insensibility to their work? And if they are not insensible, if they are evermore thinking of the best interests of the community in every sermon they meditate, if they are every week pouring out the fervor of their souls in these secret and earnest meditations, if they are living and dying with this feeling, is it reasonable to meet this feeling with doubt and suspicion, objection and complaint? If they are offered, and willingly offered upon the sacrifice and service of the people's

faith, ought not the offering at least to be accepted? Perhaps, in saying all this, I ought to acknowledge with Paul, that 'I speak this, as it were foolishly, in this confidence of boasting.' Yet I might add in his language, with regard to many, that if 'I am become a fool in glorying, ye have compelled me.'

But I will leave this topic, and pass to the less common, though constantly recurring parochial duties of a clergyman. I mean particularly, the duties he discharges in *visiting the sick.* In the first place, I say, that too much is made of this occasion, in the ado and formality that often attends it. For myself, I could wish that I might never be received as an official person in these visits, but simply as a friend. I would never have it expected that I should proceed in any particular manner—in any manner that should designate me as a clergyman. I would not have it considered as a matter of course, that I should pray. That should be determined by circumstances. I would not have it supposed that there is no devotion, no earnest supplication in the sick-room, unless there is an audible and official prayer. This is what I should consider as ascribing too much consequence to such a prayer. How many chambers of sickness have we seen, in which there are, on the part of the patient and his anxious friends—there are, from morning till evening, and through the night watches, the most deep felt and unutterable prayers. How little can the formality of devotion add to such prayers. If I could fall in with that current of feeling, and add that little to it, by giving it expression, and contributing to its guidance, I would do so. If circumstances, such as the already too intense solicitude of the sick man, or the already too much excited emotions of his friends, forbade the expression of this inward prayer, I would leave it to its silent operation. I would silently commend it to that God, 'who seeth in secret.'

But there is another view, in which I have the most painful apprehension, that too much is made of the prayers of a clergyman. The last days, perhaps, of the disobedient man, have come; the last hour of the neglecter of virtue and religion, is drawing nigh. Anxious and awakened, but not enough awakened to see through the veil of those formal and worldly notions of religion in which he has always been wrapped up, he sends for his clergyman, and asks for his prayers. It is perhaps the crisis of his disorder; his anxious friends are around him, with feelings that demand consideration; the patient himself is too feeble to bear close and scrutinizing questions, and all that can be done is to speak to him of sin, of the necessity of repentance, and faith, and resignation, and then to pray. And now, the

unhappy man may say, 'I have called for the minister of religion; I have had prayers; I regret the negligent life I have led, and I trust God will have mercy on me.' Oh! how possible is it for a man, with this thin veil of a transient ceremony, to disguise from himself the mighty and solemn realities of spiritual truth, and a spiritual retribution. How possible is it for him to feel, like the Catholic on receiving the ceremony of *extreme unction*, that he is now prepared, or, at least, better prepared to die! In the offices of religion he loses the spirit of it; he loses that conviction, so well put into the mouth of a dying person, 'O my friends, reality—reality is dealing with me now!' He does not feel that reality is dealing with him; or he feels it the less, because ceremony is dealing with him.

And it is, sir, because this factitious regard to the offices of religion cloaks and keeps out of sight the reality, that I have taken pains, at so much length, to descant upon it. Sabbaths and ordinances, rites and ceremonies, sermons and prayers, and vows and professions, outwardly made, are merely aids to religion. The moment they become evidences, instead of aids, the moment they advance one step towards occupying the place of religion itself, they begin to push religion out of men's minds, and to substitute barren formalities and vain hopes. In whatever degree they make a man more satisfied and easy, while sinful, in that degree do they strike fatally at the very root of piety and virtue. Religion is reality. How often must we say this, and how long will it be, before it is fully felt! Religion is not a form of words, nor a sound of prayers, nor a profession, nor a costume, nor a manner, nor a countenance. It is deep reality. It is principle; it is feeling; it is purpose; it is habit; it is act. It is tenderness in the conscience; it is goodness in the heart; it is daily virtue in the life; it is constant, growing, heavenly devotion in the soul. It is the living energy, and the glorious, the ineffable hope of every good man.

A word or two in close, Mr Editor, and I will relieve the patience of your readers. If I have repeated thoughts in this letter, which have been formerly stated, and I have taken no scrupulous care to avoid it, I have only to say, that the subject demands 'line upon line, and precept upon precept.' If any reader shall find in the foregoing discussion, remarks that do not apply to him, let him remember that there are other minds besides his own. If the observations, here made, have nothing to do with him, he has nothing to do with the observations; they will find those, I am confident, with whom they have something

to do. Above all, let no one suppose, that I undervalue the office of the sacred ministry. It is an instrument, I fully believe, whose power is as yet but slightly developed. Let it be stript of factitious aids, and its real power will be more apparent and more felt. It has been, in past times, but 'a naked and marrowless skeleton,' compared with the embodied and living vigor, which, I trust, it will yet put forth. D.

'REMEMBER NOW THY CREATOR IN THE DAYS OF THY YOUTH.'

O HAPPY creature! on whose brow
The light of youth is shed,
O'er whose glad path life's early flowers
In glowing beauty spread—
Forget not Him whose love hath poured
Around that golden light,
And tinged those opening buds of hope
With hues so softly bright;
But grateful to his altar bring
The garlands of life's glorious spring.

Thou tempted one! just entering
Upon 'enchanted ground,'
Ten thousand snares are spread for thee,
Ten thousand foes surround.
A dark and a deceitful band
Upon thy path they lower—
Trust not thine own unaided strength,
To save thee from their power.
Cling, cling to Him, whose mighty arm
Alone can shield thy soul from harm.

Thou, whose yet bright and joyous eye
Must soon be dimmed with tears,
To whom the hour of bitterness
Must come in coming years—
Teach early that confiding eye
To pierce the cloudy screen,
To where, above the storms of life,
Eternally serene,
A Father's love is beaming bright,
A Father's smile still sheds its light.

O born to die! the path of flowers
Thou dost exulting tread,
Leads to the dreary sepulchre,
The silence of the dead.

But if from youth thy spirit's love
Hath to thy God been given,
Death's icy hand will ope for thee
The radiant gates of heaven.
There, blest immortal! joys divine,
Transcendent, endless, shall be thine.

REVIEW.

ART. IV.—*Sermons on Various Subjects.* By WILLIAM PALEY, D. D. Originally published by Rev. EDMUND PALEY, A. M., in 1825. First American Edition. Boston. Hilliard, Gray, Little, and Wilkins. 1827. 8vo. pp. 438.

THE value of the services, which gifted minds render to the world, is not to be estimated solely by their splendor. While we look with admiration on the mighty efforts of inventive genius, or the prodigies of intellectual strength, by which mankind have been sent forward, as it were, centuries at once on the path of improvement, we are bound to welcome with gratitude and respect, the labors of those who have given wisdom and sound instruction a currency in society, and have made them the household possessions of man. In this latter class, the writings of Dr Paley claim an eminent place. No name on the catalogue of English theologians, probably, enjoys a larger share of judicious popular favor, than his. We speak of him as a popular writer, in the best sense; for there is a kind of reputation frequently designated by that term, in which he has no share. It depends on the free use of coarseness and flippancy; on calling into action a blind, false excitement; on smart witticisms, and turns of thought remarkable for nothing but their strangeness, and on that confident show of superficial reasoning, which affords just light enough to enable men to go wrong, and no more. The popular cast of Paley's writings arises from the simple, perspicuous, and sometimes homely manner, in which he presents to the mind just reasoning, genuine wisdom, and strong good sense. He may be considered as belonging, with respect to his modes of thinking and of exhibiting a subject, to the same general class with our illustrious countryman, Franklin. One, whose memory will long be among our most cherished possessions, has aptly described him as 'the theologian who makes truth intelligible

to the humblest.'* This merit he certainly has, at the same time that he is a favorite with the strongest minds; with those who read to excite their own thoughts to action, no less than with those who read to fill their minds with the thoughts of others.

Of such a man it is to be wished that a better biography might be furnished, than has yet appeared. Meadley's Memoir, which is perhaps on the whole the best, is not such as the worth of the subject demands. As a narrative it is well executed; but it fails to convey a finished impression of the character which it undertakes to exhibit, and is besides quite too much encumbered with unnecessary statements of the contents of Paley's writings. The biography by Chalmers, which is said to have been intended to counteract the views given in Meadley's work, we have had no opportunity to examine; but it would seem, from the notices taken of it, to have been written too much in the spirit and for the purposes of party. The Memoir, prefixed by Lynam to his edition of our author's works, is judicious, but too brief to be satisfactory. In the Life of Dr Paley by his son, Edmund Paley, we have been not a little disappointed. From the relation in which the writer stood to the subject of his biographical sketch, and from the advantages which that relation might be supposed to afford him, we had expected more than we have found. He has added little to what was already before the public, with the exception of a few interesting letters from different hands, and some curious details respecting the papers and manuscript books of his father. Perhaps, however, it would be unreasonable to look for more. The style of the work frequently becomes exceedingly heavy and wearisome; and the biography can lay claim to very little, if any, of that amiable interest, which filial respect might have been expected to spread over the story and the remarks.

The qualities of Dr Paley's social and private character were doubtless of the most bland and interesting kind. The same plainness and easy familiarity, which appear so attractively upon his pages, seem to have pervaded his life. His virtues, like his intellectual greatness, were tranquil and unpretending, mingled together in his character quietly and in just proportions, and not standing awry, like those of many good people, and presenting sharp and troublesome corners to all who come in contact with them. His wisdom was kind and urbane, winning upon the heart while it enriched the mind. His intercourse with oth-

* Mr Buckminster, to whose exertions, among other services to the cause of religion and literature not soon to be forgotten, we owe the American edition of Paley's Works.

ers was full of good affections, and not unfrequently enlivened by that facetiousness, which has sometimes exposed him to the charge of levity, or want of fixed and elevated principle, from those who cannot prevail upon themselves to make any allowance for the humorous carelessness of conversation. He had none of the stiff, unaccommodating, formal character, which so often mars the influence even of piety and good sense; nothing to forbid that facility of access, by which thoughts and feelings are conveyed, in all their original freshness and reality, to other minds. His benign cast of temper spread itself over even his philosophical speculations. In the fine chapter on the Divine benevolence, for instance, in the Moral Philosophy, he observes; 'There is always a bright spot in the prospect, upon which the eye rests; a single example perhaps, by which each man finds himself more convinced, than by all others put together. I seem, for my own part, to see the benevolence of the Deity more clearly in the pleasures of very young children, than in anything in the world.' Such an instance would have been selected, probably, only by one, in whom the best feelings of the heart were habitually united with the operations of a sound and clear intellect.

We, however, are chiefly concerned with Paley, as one of the moral and religious instructers of mankind; as one of those who have discharged well the high vocation of doing much to make the world wiser and better, as an able advocate of Christianity, and of just views of its truths and principles. We do not mean that he is to be classed with those preeminent men of our race, who have been the first to promulgate the great truths that outlive kingdoms and forms of polity and modes of speculation, and become imperishable landmarks of the progress of mind. Nor were his mental habits such as to lead him to those grand and exalted views, which kindle the imagination into a fine glow, while they stir the thoughts powerfully, and which always present truth in a cluster of rich and exciting associations. Moral sublimity was not his province; nor could he invest the forms of thought in the beautiful drapery that gives to rigid philosophy the attractions of poetry. He was of the Socratic, rather than of the Platonic school; for it was his delight to bring truth 'home to men's business and bosoms.' He never transports us to regions, where fancy and reason are blended to form a splendid result, but leads us in a plain path where we can always tell how far we have travelled, and whither we are going. If he is not to be ranked with the greatest divines of his church, with men like Usher, Stillingfleet, and Warburton, yet he deserves

the high praise of not having sacrificed real intellectual power to the acquisition of useless and misapplied learning. His mind wrought for itself and after its own fashion, on every subject that came before it. When we say this, we are aware that it has been quite common to charge him with a want of originality. But it should be remembered, that there may be as much originality in the setting forth of a truth or an argument, as in the discovery or invention of it. The man, whose ingenuity gives new value to old materials, can scarcely be deemed inferior to him who produces new materials. It is doubtless true, that Paley was not distinguished for mere erudition; especially in the sense, in which that term is frequently used in England and on the Continent. Whatever learning he possessed was the nutriment, not the lumber of his mind; it was so moulded and wrought upon by his own habits of thinking, that all which was valuable in it became a constituent part of his own peculiar intellectual excellence. It was very justly observed of him, that 'no man ever abused learning less, or was less the dupe of learning.' He was as far as possible from being one of those, who, as Goldsmith remarks, 'write through volumes, while they do not think through a page.' We may easily believe, what we are told, that his mind was incessantly busy and active, even when his appearance would indicate idleness or negligence. Edmund Paley observes, that 'he was most thoroughly industrious in a more desultory way, than most authors. From his first commencing writer to the last stage of his life, he was scarcely for a moment without an object, and a literary object, to rest upon. When walking, fishing, riding, gardening, sitting still in his arm chair, it appears from his papers that he was still constantly occupied. Some of the little books full of notes, seem evidently to have been his pocket companions on his short excursions or his daily walks, and these he used on his return to unburden of their cargo.' *

As an argumentative writer, Paley is certainly distinguished by some of the best characteristics of manner. He reasons with admirable perspicuity and directness. He exhibits nothing like a parade of subtilty or elaborate disquisition, and wastes none of his force in unmeaning ingenuity or misdirected inquiries. No author was ever more thoroughly free from the quackery of reasoning, or from the arts which delight the lovers of mysticism; and few have exemplified so happily the maxim of Quintilian, that one should write not only so as to be understood, but as to render it impossible not to be understood. He never hesi-

* Life, p. 187.

tated to sacrifice refinement, or even to adopt a blunt and inelegant manner, for the sake of being lucid. There are writers on moral and theological subjects, who, if one may judge from their works, would esteem this no very high praise. They seem to consider it the office of language to darken and confound, instead of enlightening and guiding the understanding, and think that to be wiser than others is only to be more unintelligible, forgetting that waters are not necessarily deep because they are muddy. We need not always go back so far as the days of scholastic learning, to find specimens of this unfortunate mode of discussion; for at all times, theology, more perhaps than any other department of inquiry, has been burdened with what Burke designates as 'the infectious stuff, which is imported by the smugglers of adulterated metaphysics.' Simple and plain statements have been deemed very spiritless. It has been thought that a proposition is the more likely to be true for being hard to be understood, and that they are the wisest adepts in the science of divinity, who can most laboriously surround a subject with difficulties, only to make reason and common sense stare at the profound explanation which at last comes forth. It is this taste, which has made the access to truth long and hard to be found, conducting the inquirer through many a winding path and many a forest of words, and throwing a mist around speculations, that they may appear the larger and more imposing. From these, and kindred faults in reasoning, Paley was remarkably free. He thought, and consequently wrote, clearly and distinctly. His mental habits led him to bring everything to bear on the topic before him in the shortest and plainest way. All the arts that are used to prolong and involve a discussion, all the expedients by which a reader may be puzzled without being convinced, were despised by him. He brings forth his thoughts precisely as they lie in his mind; and whatever we may think of his conclusions or the force of his arguments, we are always sure that we know what he means. He never goes round about a subject, but fixes his grasp at once upon it. This straight forward way of dealing imparts to his writings a tone of warm sincerity, which no flourish of phraseology, no affectation of wisdom can bestow, and which is certainly one of the finest traits in the management of ethical and theological subjects. It would be difficult to select, from the catalogue of English authors, one who is less exposed than Paley to the keen rebuke implied in the title given by Campbell to a chapter in his Philosophy of Rhetoric;—'What is the cause that nonsense so often escapes being detected both by the writer and by the reader?'

Another excellence of Paley's reasoning is to be found in its freedom from all inappropriate considerations. He disencumbers his subject from unnecessary appendages, breaks it down into distinct portions, and gives each one its true bearing. He is far enough from being one of those, whom Seed has facetiously described by saying that 'they often start so much game in the wide and spacious field of thinking, that they overtake none.' With a quick and shrewd perception of what belongs and what does not belong to the question, Paley fixes a steady, luminous point before the reader, and then presses towards it, without straining after all that comes within his reach as he proceeds. His course of thought is consequently never embarrassed by those irrelevant views, into which many minds, from ill regulated habits of association, are apt to be seduced. The skill with which he rejects whatever appertains not to the subject, enables him to present it to the reader cleared from perplexing entanglements, and to leave a strong and well defined impression on the mind. Hence his reasoning acquires a compactness of manner and unity of purpose, which very few moral writers possess in an equal degree, and by means of which he gives, at the outset, a peculiarly vivid and full conception of the nature of the point to be examined or maintained. Every one familiar with his works will recollect, as instances, the beautiful statement of the argument at the beginning of the Natural Theology and the Horæ Paulinæ, and the introduction to the remarks on Property in the Moral Philosophy. There is a mode of disquisition, that has at times been much in favor, and was so especially among the old English writers, which consists in loading a discussion with whatever can, by however remote an affinity, be supposed to have connexion with it; in beginning at a distance, and approaching it gradually through many avenues; in combining with it intimately considerations that are extraneous or merely incidental, and in adding to it a long train of concluding remarks, that might be appended almost as well to one topic as to another. All this sometimes arises from confusion of thought in the mind of the writer, who has never taken so close a survey of the field before him as to enable him to distinguish between the appropriate and the inappropriate; or from an ambition of display, which induces him to encumber his progress with all the knowledge and all the thoughts that can be gathered around it; or from an irresistible propensity for 'the arts by which a big book is made.' From all such unwieldy modes of conducting an inquiry, it is a relief to turn to a writer like Paley, who gives us the spirit of a subject without its trappings.

It is likewise a striking beauty in Dr Paley's discussions, that he never permits himself to overdo in his reasoning. He is diligently careful not to press his proofs and illustrations further than they are fitted to reach; and while he applies them with great force and propriety within the range which they may justly claim, he wisely abstains from attempting to make them pass for more than they are worth. Instead of committing the common fault of striving to prove too much, he sometimes even forbears from the fair and legitimate use which might be made of his train of thought. Edmund Paley remarks justly, though somewhat too strongly, 'that his usual way of dealing with an argument, was, not to build half so much upon it as it would bear, in order to make sure at least of the groundwork.' The calmness, with which he habitually adjusted his views, secured him from being transported beyond the bounds of accuracy by zeal to establish a point. It is no uncommon mistake to be so in love with a favorite argument or speculation, as to bring discredit or suspicion upon it by a misapplication of its force to purposes which it cannot properly be made to serve. But the discriminating caution, which constituted so important a feature in the character of Paley's mind, would not suffer him to be easily deceived by an overweening estimate of the value of any consideration, however brilliant or beautiful. As an instance of this, we may refer to the judgment he delivers, in the Natural Theology, on the relative use and importance of astronomy in furnishing proofs of the agency of an intelligent Creator. His opinion on this point coincides remarkably with that of Malebranche, who had long before observed, that 'the least fly discovers more the power and wisdom of God to those that consider it with attention, and without being prejudiced by its smallness, than all which the astronomers know of the heavens.' The natural effect of such fairness and moderation in the use of evidence on behalf of a proposition, is to inspire the reader with a feeling of security, a confidence that he will not be misled by the argumentative expedients of a partisan. After having formed an acquaintance with Paley, we take up his works with the persuasion, that what he has to say, comes from a mind which has examined accurately the proportions of the subject, and has not grown so warm over any speculation as to magnify everything connected with it into extravagant and unjustifiable dimensions; and the consequence is, that he often leaves us willing to grant more, instead of less than he demands.

Paley's discussions and reasoning are, moreover, characterised by a racy vigor, which gives them at times an unusual de-

gree of attraction. They wear no appearance of preparation to produce an effect, so that the energy, with which they are not unfrequently stamped, takes us as if by surprise, and at once fixes a distinct and strong impression of a truth or principle. His brief and bold way of stating a thought, enables it to seize the attention with a quick and powerful grasp. This strength seems always to rise spontaneously from his forcible mode of treating a subject, and not to be the result of painstaking effort. It resembles the vigor belonging to the healthful condition of a good physical constitution, rather than the temporary impulse obtained by stimulants and unnatural excitements. A train of remark and illustration sometimes expands and glows under his hands, till, by the bare power of the thought, it rises to eloquence the more noble and affecting for being unadorned. The admirable observations, for example, on the relation of sleep to night, in the seventeenth chapter of the Natural Theology, may be ranked among the most energetic passages in our language, and we should be disposed to think but ill of the state of his mind or heart, who could read them without emotion. We may observe in general of Paley's style, that it takes its distinctive character, as every writer's style should, from his peculiar cast of mind, and reflects a clear image of the state and process of his thoughts.

There is one of Paley's works, which, notwithstanding its many excellences, has drawn upon his name some obloquy, and not a little deserved censure. We allude to his Moral Philosophy, a book, the merits of which are certainly great, and the faults perhaps not inconsiderable, though we cannot but think these have been sometimes quite too much magnified. It presents the science of ethics in a more popular and pleasing form, than had been given to it before. The philosophy of morals and politics, which had generally been treated in a manner so technical, obscure, or formal as to lose much of its interest, is here expounded with most captivating perspicuity, exhibited in its practical relations to common duties and daily affairs, and rendered attractive by apt and familiar illustrations. In the details of ethical instruction, it is doubtless one of the best works we have. We therefore regret the more that its usefulness should be in any degree diminished by the incautious manner in which some of the principles are laid down, and by unguarded assertions, which, however harmless to readers accustomed to investigate and think for themselves, are liable to much abuse, if adopted as current maxims by the heedless and unskilful. We have not space to remark at large, upon the unphilosophical and indefensible doctrine, that expediency is the foun-

dation and the measure of right, which occupies so prominent a place in this work. This doctrine had been advanced by Hume, and by Brown, author of the Essays on the Characteristics; but in Paley's theory of morals, connected as it is with a reference to the will of God as a rule, it appears perhaps in its least objectionable shape. The ground which he took with regard to the principle of expediency, was disputed by Gisborne with considerable ability; but one of the best essays we remember to have seen on this theory of morals, is an Examination of Modern Ethics, which first appeared in the form of a letter in London, and parts of which were reprinted in this country, in the Literary Miscellany published at Cambridge more than twenty years ago. Paley's opinion on Subscription to Articles of Religion has likewise met severe reprobation. His manner of treating this subject is doubtless one of the many evidences of the mischievous influence of an ecclesiastical establishment, in beguiling the judgment into satisfaction with such constructions and interpretations, as are rejected at once by minds unaccustomed to the associations created by a national church. We see no reason however to doubt that he was perfectly honest in his views on this point; and they were probably adopted partly from a sincere and liberal wish to widen the ground of conformity as much as possible, in consistency with the nature of an established religion. In his letter to Dr Percival this matter is treated perhaps more satisfactorily, than in the chapter devoted to it in the Moral Philosophy. We certainly have no inclination to defend Dr Paley's view of subscription; yet it should not be forgotten, that similar modes of considering the articles of his church had received the sanction of wise and good men. Chillingworth subscribed them as articles of peace, not of belief; and this he did, not before his scruples had led him to examine the matter, as it would seem, with conscientious integrity.*

The Natural Theology and the View of the Evidences of Christianity, are allowed, by general concession, we presume, to rank among the best works of their kind. There are none, indeed, to which we should so readily assign the very highest place. The former has not, we think, been surpassed in powerful exhibitions of the important and beautiful argument from ap-

* Wakefield's brief remarks on Paley's Moral Philosophy, as a whole, are, we think, discriminating and just. 'Notwithstanding some weak and erroneous principles,' he observes, 'it may be recommended as an excellent summary of useful, practicable, edifying morality, delivered in a style perspicuous and most explicit, vigorous without stiffness, and copious without redundancy. This treatise is particularly admirable for an undissembled statement of difficulties and objections.' Memoirs, vol. 1. p. 129.

pearances of design—an argument for the being of God not only best of all adapted to popular use, but more satisfactory, we believe, even to inquisitive and reflecting minds, than any other—in acute, watchful, and religious observation of the wonders of nature, in the fairness with which objections are met, and in the skill with which the just force of separate instances is made to bear on the general proposition. The latter contains a better and more convincing array of the christian evidences, than is to be found perhaps anywhere else within the same compass, and is distinguished by the spirit of fairness and sobriety, which prevails throughout the whole. We find in it none of that supercilious dogmatism and poor sarcasm, with which works in defence of Christianity, as if in imitation of the infidel tone and spirit, have sometimes been disgraced. It is in every part stamped with the impartial and dispassionate character, which springs from a just feeling of the dignity of a good cause, and from a heartfelt love of truth. No argument is overstrained, and there is none of the insolent boasting of a victorious champion.

The Horæ Paulinæ seems not to have received, so generally as it ought, the high estimation it deserves. It is said to have been the least successful of Paley's works, at the time of its publication; and it has perhaps been less read since, than any other of his productions. We can scarcely account for this comparative neglect, unless it be that the detail of instances, by which the point of the reasoning is sustained, is not adapted to excite an interest in readers impatient of attention, or that, as the proofs are so often repeated, the mind assents to the general truth to be evinced, before the author has discharged his subject. This treatise is certainly a most skilful statement and happy developement of the argument from undesigned coincidences, and is perhaps more strictly original than the other writings of Paley. If we were required to select the contribution to a single portion of the christian evidences, which deserves to be most highly prized, we know not to what work we should turn so promptly as to the Horæ Paulinæ.

Among the minor writings of our author, the Reasons for Contentment should be mentioned with peculiar praise. We are told by his son, that he himself made this remark upon it; 'The best thing I ever wrote.' The object of this pamphlet was to contribute something towards checking the feverish spirit of disorganization, which the excitement produced by the French revolution was then fast sending abroad in the land. It is a fine specimen of Paley's happiest peculiarities of thought and manner. His Speech on the Abolition of the Slave

Trade, deserves notice, not only on account of its merits, but as an evidence that he was among the first who took a decided stand against that detestable traffic. He is said to have suggested plans for the civilisation of some portions of Africa, and to have entertained views similar to those on which the Colonization Society is founded.

The theological views of such a man as Paley, have of course been regarded with no ordinary interest. To the friends of enlightened and liberal principles belongs the high satisfaction of ranking his among the illustrious names which adorn their cause. Meadley intimates that the company in which he most delighted, had its influence in subjecting him to the charge of heterodoxy, and that one whose patron was Bishop Law, and whose friend, Dr Jebb, could scarcely escape the imputation of heresy. But Dr Paley's own predominant cast of thought, without any extraneous influence, sufficiently accounts for the complexion of his religious views. That a familiar acquaintance with the acute and powerful mind of Bishop Law, should have confirmed every liberal tendency in his admirer, may easily be believed; but these tendencies themselves were wrought into the very texture of his mental and moral constitution. His reverence for the truths of revelation was honest and strong. He took great delight in the study of the christian scriptures, and applied himself to it with uncommon singleness of heart, and without losing sight, for a moment, of the times and circumstances in which the sacred writings were composed. He did not consider the interpretation of scripture a mere business of the grammar and the lexicon, as it has sometimes, absurdly enough, been represented.* Few men have brought to the task so much of the sagacious perception of the relation of parts to the whole, and the consequent modifications of meaning; so much of the clear apprehension of the precise state of mind in the writer and in those to whom he wrote, and of the wants and condition of their age; so much of the moral taste and tact, which belong essentially to the character of a good interpreter of the sacred books. The sermon entitled, Caution recommended in the Use and Application of Scripture Language, may be adduced as a specimen of his correct and judicious manner of viewing the phraseology of the New Testament, though it contains expressions that are quite too abrupt and unqualified. It has been said, we know, that a change took place in his sentiments with respect to the topics of this sermon, and that at a later period the author him-

* See Dr Chalmer's extraordinary work on the Evidences.

self disapproved of it. This however is a random assertion, which his son has shown to be unsupported by any satisfactory evidence.* We are not at all solicitous, that Paley should be called a Unitarian, though the name has sometimes been bestowed upon him in the form of reproach and accusation. We suppose no one, who is well acquainted with his modes of reasoning, and the results at which he arrived, will doubt that he must share the obloquy of being denied the christian name, if judged by the present fashionable standard of the Exclusive System. The apprehension, which has been sometimes evinced, that he meant more heresy than he expressed, and the manner in which his writings have been treated by sectarian bigotry, are sufficient indications that his faith is not deemed to have been of the suitable dimensions, by those who claim for themselves a monopoly of religious truth.

The name, however, under which Paley is to be classed, is not of the slightest importance. It is enough, that he was one of those benefactors of mankind, whose labors are rich and lasting contributions to the great cause of rational theology; who have done much to open the minds of men to just and adequate conceptions of the strong proofs and holy purposes of the christian revelation; who have employed their high powers in the good work of removing rubbish, in order to arrive at the simple substance of the gospel; and who, rather than assume the attitude and the armour of mere partisans, have set in motion the springs of true and heavenly principles, which, in their operation, take up and crush in their grasp, the works of error, superstition, and corruption. Though he cared not to appear as a polemic, yet few better correctives than his writings are to be found for those unhappy influences, that have so much crippled the direct and powerful energy, with which Christianity should act on the spiritual improvement of man, and have held it back on its course of glory. He was never one of those who take the transient gleams, reflected from the particular state of their own opinions and feelings, for the everlasting light of truth, and identify religion with certain modes of belief and operation, as if the interests of Christianity were lodged there, and there only. 'That he was not obliged to think himself of any party seems to have been the very estimation he most coveted,' says Edmund Paley. However indefensible this may be deemed, as a general principle, yet we cannot but rejoice, instead of lamenting, that some of the greatest minds, some of the wisest instructers of our race, have shunned the service of party, and have chosen rather to bring

* Life by Edmund Paley, p. 116.

their learning, talents, and piety to the illustration of scripture, and to the exhibition of the grand, general principles and truths of religion in all their glorious aspects. They have been disposed to think most highly of the value of that large portion of truth, which is found in all the varieties of christian faith; and have not forgotten that, with respect to other points, what are called opinions, are frequently not so much opinions, strictly speaking, as they are occasions of exciting trains of emotions and feelings, and of cherishing associations, that may be of a much better cast than the creed from which they spring. They have considered attachment to peculiar speculative views as a feeling that grows up and becomes strong from various causes, independent of the great principles in which vital goodness finds its best support; and have learned, from observation and from history, that certain doctrines and certain minds come together by a sort of natural attraction, the springs of which are out of sight perhaps, but do not necessarily affect the essential constituents of christian character. The kindness, with which they have regarded what is good in all, has led opposite partisans to appropriate the credit of their names each to his peculiar system. De Burigny, the biographer of Grotius, tells us that this great man was claimed by various diverse sects. He quotes Father Briet's testimony on the subject, which is sufficiently curious and amusing;—'This year died Hugo Grotius, the honor and glory of men of learning; his intention was to die a Catholic, but he wanted time; for, as he assured me, he believed as we do.' The ludicrous mistake into which this good Papist fell, from his eagerness to add the weight of an eminent name to his cause, is but an instance of a very common propensity.

It is no matter to what denomination in the dictionary of religions a writer may belong, while he belongs to that denomination of the wise and the pious, who have in the main brought good sense, sound reason, and christian theology into inseparable union. The number of those, who have done this, is indeed much smaller than the friend of man and of religion could wish. The waste of intellect, occasioned by the zealous industry that was for so many years expended upon the most ridiculous questions by the scholastic metaphysicians, has been justly deplored. We have cause to lament a similar waste of mental strength in the department of christian divinity. The efforts of many powerful minds have been almost entirely lost to the cause of real religious improvement by being misdirected; by being spent upon topics that fall into insignificance in proportion as mankind become enlightened. Treatises of theology have

been filled with the attempts of laborious ingenuity to solve the enigmas, and reconcile the contradictions, which time has gathered around Christianity. It would seem as if success in such efforts had been measured by the adroitness, with which specious, and apparently profound arguments could be adduced for propositions that were acknowledged to do violence to the understanding and the feelings of man. Modes of reasoning, and of arriving at conclusions, have been adopted without hesitation, which the same writers would probably have rejected at once, if applied to other subjects. Hence we may account for, if not excuse the disgust so often felt by distinguished laymen with respect to religious discussions. They have found, in too many of them, a strange and perverse cast of thought, a prevalence of exaggerated statements, and an absence of those principles of sound sense and legitimate reasoning to which they have been accustomed on other topics; and they have thus come to regard the sublime science of divinity as a technical business, a province by itself, to be left to the management of those to whom it is assigned as a professional charge. The injury inflicted upon the interests of religion by this unhappy method of exhibiting it, has, we fear, been deep and extensive. We would render ample honor to the mental acuteness and strength of those, who have thus misapplied their powers. But we ask whether such writings have not given abundant ground for the remark, that 'a theological system is too often a temple consecrated to implicit faith; and he who enters in to worship there, instead of leaving his shoes, after the Eastern manner, must leave his understanding at the door; and it will be well if he finds it when he comes out again.'

The writers with whom Paley must be classed, view this whole subject in a totally different manner. They regard the christian religion as a system in perfect harmony with all that we know of the intellectual and moral constitution of man. They love to consider the gospel mainly as the instrument which God has chosen to purify, elevate, and bless the human race; as the spiritual tuition by which we are to be trained to the happiness that is the natural fruit of goodness; as designed to exert a direct and powerful agency in promoting the highest improvement of which we are susceptible; as exercising a solemn jurisdiction over thoughts, purposes, and motives, by bringing a message from Heaven to our hearts and souls, and above all, as pointing to the retributions of futurity, and as enforcing its instructions by the awful sanctions that take hold on eternity. It seems to them to speak in tones of encouragement and grace,

to wear the aspect of man's best friend, and to have terror only for man's worst enemy, sin; to be, not a series of impulses, but a steady and regular influence, which shines like sunlight into our dwellings, and guides us in our daily duties and employments. They are willing to believe that the great purpose of our Saviour's mission, was a sublime moral purpose, and that it was perfectly adapted to the nature of man, as a subject of God's government and a child of immortality. They can see no reason why we should be regarded as totally different beings in our religious relations, from what we are in any other relations, so that the same laws of thinking and reasoning cannot be applied to us in both. Christianity seems to them most worthy of all veneration, when it is considered as having met and satisfied the great want of man, which was never met and satisfied before; as possessing an affinity with all that is excellent and imperishable in the human constitution; and they rejoice to know that there is not a holy and elevated thought, not a pure and heavenward desire, not a far reaching and sublime aspiration within us, that is not drawn, by a natural tendency, towards the religion of Jesus Christ, as towards its source of warmth and light. The opinions, which would in course be connected with such views, were the opinions of Paley. He loved best the undisputed truths of religion, and thought Christianity was never so justly appreciated, as when it was made the practical philosophy of life.

The sermons of Dr Paley we have always regarded as decidedly among the best in our language. In saying this, we do not mean to imply that they are distinguished by what are usually considered great and splendid qualities, by masterly strokes of eloquence, or by an overflowing richness of discussion. If one should expect to find in them the gorgeous beauties of style, the ample array of all the thoughts a subject can suggest, and the pungent appeals, which marked the discourses of some of the old school of English preachers in the days of Taylor, Barrow, Bates, and Baxter, he would certainly be disappointed. Nor do they possess that combination, so rare as well as beautiful, of fine thought with devout fervor, which entitles the volume of our own Buckminster to so exalted a place among the labors of the pulpit. Excellences of these kinds were not such as would naturally grow out of Paley's peculiar character of mind. His talent lay, not in affecting description or impassioned address, but in a clear and forcible display of views, the power of which is in their truth and justness. He would seem to have adopted the sentiment, that was once well expressed in the introduction to a discourse;—'It is enough for me that I speak to wise men

whose reason shall be my rhetoric, to Christians whose conscience shall be my eloquence.' We find accordingly, as we might expect, that Paley's sermons are not among the compositions, which take strong hold on the passions, or charm the imagination, or kindle a confused excitement in the mind. We do not mean that they are cold or feeble. Far from it. If there be power in a luminous and happy exposition of a subject, in a plain and direct application of truth to the actual condition and business of men, so that it is made to touch them on every side, and to be interwoven with all the conceptions they can form of life and conduct; if there be power in pressing home upon the understanding and the conscience, the clear and well defined obligations of solemn religious principles, then is there power, and not a little of it, in the discourses of which we speak. They are remarkable for a perspicuous and explicit manner beyond those of any other writer, perhaps, except Robert Robinson.

Few preachers have known better than Paley, how to open a direct avenue between their thoughts and the thoughts of their hearers; few have understood more accurately the art of throwing their minds into the minds of others. His sermons are never encumbered with a circuitous introduction, nor do they set out with tracing the remote relations of a subject, as if he feared he should not find enough to say. The point to be discussed or enforced is brought before us at once, with admirable distinctness; explanations are stated briefly, but satisfactorily; difficulties, having been allowed all their force, are cleared up; and just those views which are pertinent, and no others, are advanced, with an honest, hearty simplicity of manner, and occasionally with a homeliness of phraseology, in which, we think, the unvitiated taste will find a peculiar charm. It was one of Paley's merits as a preacher, and it is not so common a merit as could be wished, that he knew when to be done. His sermons are singularly distinguished by brevity, and unity of purpose. Instead of presenting to us large prospects, where the eye is lost and the mind bewildered in the wide extent, and where, because so many things are seen, nothing is seen clearly, he fixes upon a single object, and holds our attention to it long enough to dismiss us with one strong, distinct, and finished conception. In this respect, his practice was in conformity to his own advice to a friend;—'Let one impression be but made, and send it home with your congregation, and you do more for them than by giving them twenty comments.'

It is probably from rigid adherence to this principle, that the close of his sermons sometimes appears dry and abrupt. On the score of general usefulness, we might regret that he has not

furnished his discourses with stirring applications to the feelings, did we not remember that there is a very valuable class of minds in the community, to whom religious truth never presents itself so efficaciously, as when it comes in the quiet strength of good sense, and with the attractive grace of sober and just statements. We are far from intending to charge Paley with the fault of languid disquisition, for nothing could be more unjust. Indeed, we think earnestness is one of the strong and deep traits of his sermons; that earnestness, which springs from sincere conviction, and bespeaks a mind full and a heart warm with the subject; not that appearance of it, which pours itself out in declamation, or storms the ear with mere words. Paley never attempted to manage the machinery of rhetoric, nor to make pulpit orations. And, though his style of preaching has its faults, we apprehend it to be far better, than the glaring magnificence and tumid extravagance of Dr Chalmers, the overstrained attempts at the pathetic and the startling in the French school of preachers, or the strain of coarse, exaggerated representation, and the martial rodomontade, for we know not what else to call it, which seem to be getting into fashion in some quarters among ourselves. We say it is better, not merely because it is more to our taste, but because we believe it to be more useful, edifying, and effective. The mistaken and overdone efforts to be impressive, to which we have alluded, are apt to leave on well adjusted minds a strong feeling of a want of reality, fatal, in a great degree, even to the power that truly belongs to them; a feeling, which, we may say without fear of contradiction, no one ever carried away from the perusal of Paley's sermons. In them everything is terse, significant, and in fair proportions; there is no straining for effect; we are under no necessity of being on our guard against imposition. What is said is sure to strike a chord in unison with the soundest judgment and most worthy feelings; and while no thought or truth is robbed of its just and real strength, the attempt is never made, by the help of inflation, to give it an artificial and perishable strength. Between the gaudy and overstrained style of preaching, which has always had its periods of being in great favor, of being welcomed as the oration of Herod was of old, and the plain, direct, earnest sermons of Paley, there is a difference not unlike that between lawless romance and sober history, between the fantastic forms assumed by a rolling mass of clouds, and the clear, calm, and beautiful sunshine.*

* Paley's discourses exhibit a very appropriate illustration of the following

Dr Paley is said to have taken great pleasure in the composition of sermons, and to have continued it almost to the last hours of his life. It is a curious fact, that his style of preaching seems to have undergone a remarkable change. No one, who is familiar with his published writings, would suppose that his sermons could ever have been verbose and sentimental, or that he could have caught, in any degree, the spirit of Hervey or Sterne. Yet we are told by his son, that some of his early productions for the pulpit, while he was at Greenwich, partook largely of this character; and one or two extracts, which he gives from manuscripts, are certainly such as we should have ascribed to almost any author more readily than to Paley. It is difficult to account for this temporary indulgence of a taste for the florid manner, so totally unlike his whole cast of thinking and writing afterwards. It was probably one of those youthful faults, from which the greatest minds are not exempt, but which a mind like his would naturally very soon discard. We are struck with a still more remarkable incongruity, when we are informed that his first known composition was a poem in the manner of Ossian.

That volume of Paley's sermons, which has been before the public so long and with so much approbation, was first printed, in compliance with a direction in his will, for gratuitous distribution among his parishioners. It was, to a considerable extent, prepared and arranged by himself, in the latter part of his life, when disease and pain disabled him for public services. Few volumes of this kind have found so much well deserved favor with reflecting and judicious readers. Of a work so familiarly known, it is not necessary for us to go into a detail of commendation. It is full of the author's peculiar traits. The sermon on the Dangers incidental to the Clerical Character, is worthy of all praise for the admirable good sense, the sagacious, penetrating spirit of observation, which are condensed into it, and should be thoroughly studied by every clergyman. As to the sermons of a doctrinal cast in this volume, he who does not find them conformable to his own faith, must at least accord to them the praise of fair and perspicuous reasoning, of christian moderation, of candor in meeting and answering objections, and

pithy remarks by Cecil in his admirable Remains;—'One of the most important considerations, in making a sermon, is to disembarrass it as much as possible.—The sermons of the last century were like their large, unwieldly chairs. Men have now a far more true idea of a chair. They consider it as a piece of furniture to sit upon, and they cut away from it everything that embarrasses and encumbers it. It requires as much reflection and wisdom to know what is not to be put into a sermon, as what is.'—p. 88.

of entire freedom from the bad temper of the dogmatist. Those which are wholly of a practical character, breathe a fine spirit of vital seriousness, of evangelical plainness and sobriety. They have the same direct, forthright character, the same unadorned strength, which are wrought into the other writings of the author; and he who can read them without edification, has, we think, great reason to suspect himself of a diseased state of mind and of moral feeling.

The additional volume of sermons, with which we are now favored, and the title of which stands at the head of this article, was published about three years ago by Edmund Paley, who doubtless enjoyed the best opportunities of examining his father's manuscripts for the purpose of selection. When it was announced that a new series of discourses had been thus prepared and given to the public, we feared that the enterprise might better have been forborne. The friends of great men and popular writers not unfrequently commit the mistake of making too free use of their papers after their death, and eagerly send forth to the world what it would have been more judicious to have withheld; 'as if they thought,' says one, 'a heap of stones or rubbish a better monument, than a little tomb of marble.' Our apprehensions were, that such might be the case with respect to this publication, especially as it was known that the other volume had been, in some measure, collected and prepared by Paley himself, and therefore might be supposed to contain those sermons, which he judged most worthy of being committed to the press. An examination of the present volume has, however, entirely relieved us from this fear; for, at least, it does no dishonor to the name of Paley, and is a truly valuable addition to the works of a favorite author, for which the public will have reason to be grateful. As a whole, it will not probably be deemed equal in merit to its predecessor; but it bears throughout marks of the strong hand of Paley, and no one can fail to recognise here, the same acute mind, the same tone of hearty sincerity and christian seriousness, the same powerful sagacity of observation, the same perspicuity of statement, illustration, and defence, by which he had before been instructed and delighted. Some of the last sermons in the collection are the protographs of several chapters, which appear in the Natural Theology, the Moral Philosophy, and the Evidences of Christianity. The remarks are here, however, expanded, in some respects, into more detail, than in the form which they took as parts of those works, and in the sermon on Suicide, we find the doctrine of expediency, and of regard to general consequences, stated almost in

the same words as in the Moral Philosophy. With the republication of these, however, we find no fault; since in their present form they not only contain new matter, but afford us an agreeable insight into the manner in which Paley turned his sermons to account in the composition of his larger works.

Our limits will not permit us, nor is it necessary, to treat at length of the merits of particular sermons in this excellent collection. They who have read Meadley's Life of Paley, will remember that the sermon on Honesty, is there spoken of, in terms of the highest commendation, as the production of a master's hand, and as having been listened to with great and uncommon interest. It is published in the book before us, and we turned to it with highly raised expectations. But we confess they were disappointed. It is a very judicious and useful discourse; but it is not, by any means, to be ranked among Paley's best efforts of this kind. The sermons on the Analogy between our Natural and Religious Progress, on the Advantages of Old Age, and on Different Degrees of Future Rewards and Punishments, seem to us to claim the highest place in this volume, and to be in the author's best mode of thinking and writing. In the following extract from the last of these, a principle is set forth, which ought to be much more regarded than it is, when we speak of the retributions of a future life.

'Now the actual conduct of different persons being different, and the same conduct differing in merit and demerit, according to the daily opportunity and temptation which the agent experienced, all which circumstances are subject to a multiplied variety, it must follow, that guilt and virtue in different individuals differ in every possible degree; that whatever reason there is to expect from the Divine Being that he will reward virtue and punish vice at all, we have the same reason to expect, as far as the light of nature goes, that he will adapt his rewards and punishments in exact proportion to the virtue or guilt of those who stand at his judgment seat. Very true, it is not thus in human judicature. The same punishment is inflicted upon crimes of very different color and malignancy; and crimes of the same denomination have very different guilt in different persons and different circumstances. But this is a defect in human laws, and proceeds from a defect of power. We have no knowledge of each other's motives and circumstances, to be able to ascertain with precision our mutual merit or guilt; or, if we could, there exists not within the compass of human treatment that precise gradation of punishment which is necessary to a perfect retribution of so much pain for so much guilt;—but no such defect, either of knowledge or power, can be imputed to the Deity. He knows the secrets of our hearts, the true motive and the exact value of every virtue, all the circumstances of aggravation and mitigation which attend every crime, and he can form and mould his creatures, so as to make them susceptible of every degree of happiness, and of every degree of misery.' pp. 305–306.

The sermon on The Stirring of Conscience, contains some excellent practical considerations on the corruptions, to which

'the court of chancery within the breast,' as it has been well called, is exposed.

'*Any course of sin whatever* weakens the power of conscience, not only as to that sin, but as to all. Either the person reflects that it is to no purpose to guard against other sins, whilst he knowingly, constantly, and wilfully goes on in this; or else the principle itself of conscience, by being so often overpowered and beaten back in this instance, has lost its spring and energy in all instances. Almost all, even the greatest sinners, have begun with some particular vice. The first encroachment upon innocence and upon conscience, was made by some single species of offence to which they were tempted; but the rottenness spread. A general and complete depravity of character may grow, and often does grow, out of one species of transgression; because conscience, which has been put to silence, not by one or two oppositions, but by a course of opposition to its remonstrances, ceases to execute its office within that man's breast; so that a conscience, which was once alive, may be reduced to a state of death and insensibility.' p. 12.

The thirteenth discourse under the title, Religion not a mere Feeling, but an Active Principle, is worthy of the subject. We give a single quotation from it.

'The passage from thought to action, from religious sentiments to religious conduct, seems a difficult attainment. I said before, the very beginnings are blessings. Holy thoughts, though occasional, though sudden, though brought on, it may be, by calamity and affliction, though roused in us we do not know how, are still the beginnings of grace. Let no man therefore, despise serious thoughts; let no man scorn or ridicule them in others; least of all the man who has none himself; for there is still a wide difference between him who thinks, though *but* occasionally, of his duty and of his salvation, and him who never permits himself to entertain such thoughts at all. One, it is true, may be far from having completed his work; the other has not begun his. Those very meditations which he despises in other men, because he sees that they have not the influence which they ought to have upon their lives and conversation, are, nevertheless, what he himself must *begin* with, what he himself must come to, if ever he enter truly upon a christian course. It is from good thoughts and good resolutions that the christian character must set out; it is with these it must begin; it is by these it must be formed. We cannot, however, always be thinking about religion. That is true; but the thing wanted of us, the thing necessary for us, the thing required in the text, is, not that religion be constantly in our thoughts, but that it have a constant influence upon our behaviour; and that is a very intelligible distinction, and takes place in common life.' pp. 74–75.

The following passage from the sermon on Repentance is but one among many instances of Paley's familiar style and apt illustrations.

'Almost every man can be sorry for his sins; every man can deplore and forsake them. Most men, indeed, make some shortlived efforts to become virtuous; but perseverance is what they want, and fail in. Yet in one sense there is one essential change made in every sinner who repents; which change consists in this, that whereas before he was growing worse, he is now growing better. His improvement may be slow; but

be it ever so slow, there is still this difference between growing better and growing worse. It resembles to my apprehension, the case of a patient in a fever. We say that his distemper has had a turn; yet take him an hour or a day past the turn, or so much before, and you will observe little alteration; for the alteration is, that whereas he was before growing worse, and weaker, by almost insensible degrees, so now he is growing better and stronger, though by degrees equally slow. And this the physician accounts a great alteration; and so it is, although it be long before he be well, and though he be in perpetual danger of a relapse, during the progress of his recovery. And the physician pronounces expressly, that there has been a turn in the disorder, that the crisis is past, not because his patient is now well, who before was ill, but because he finds him now gradually growing stronger and well, who before was gradually becoming ill.' p. 194.

In the latter of the two sermons on Good Friday, is a brief, clear, and judicious view of the Doctrine of Reconciliation, though it contains nothing new on the subject.

The Charges are a valuable part of the volume. They belong to occasions and topics, on which Paley's peculiarities of mind appear to much advantage. Some of them are adapted exclusively to the forms and duties of the English Church, and have not much interest for us. But they are all full of the practical wisdom which was an essential part of the author's intellectual character. In the Charge on Afternoon Lectures may be found a discriminating judgment on the merits of Doddridge's Expositor; and in that on Sunday Schools we were pleased to meet the following notice.

'The late General Washington, who appears to have bent his mind to the subject of public education with peculiar attention, made provision in his will, both for the education of the poor children of his neighborhood, and the neighborhood of his estates, and also for the education of the young slaves until the period of their legal manumission should arrive.'—p. 438.

Amidst the clamor of attack and defence that resounds on every side, it is refreshing to turn to a volume, in which religion appears in its plain and sober character; in its peacefulness and purity; in alliance with our best feelings and most elevated thoughts, calm, dignified, and rational, serious without gloom, earnest without extravagance, and drawing its most solemn lessons and most powerful motives from the momentous connexion between well doing here and well being hereafter.

We should be glad to see some of the sermons in this volume printed in the form of tracts for popular use. We believe there are few which would do more good.

ART. V.—*The Life of Napoleon Buonaparte, Emperor of the French. With a Preliminary View of the French Revolution. By* THE AUTHOR OF 'WAVERLEY,' &c. Philadelphia, Carey, Lea & Carey, 1827. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. 516, 400, 438.

IN a former number of our work,* we reviewed the life and character of Napoleon Bonaparte. We resume the subject, not for the purpose of speaking more largely of the individual, but that we may consider more distinctly the *principle of action* which governed him, and of which he was a remarkable manifestation.

The passion for power was Bonaparte's ruling principle. Power was his idol. He worshipped no other. To gain supremacy and unlimited sway, to subject men to his will, was his chief, settled, unrelenting purpose. This passion drew and converted into itself the whole energy of his nature. The love of power, that common principle, explains, in a great degree, his character and life. His crimes did not spring from any passion or impulse peculiar to himself. With all his contempt of the human race, he still belonged to it. It is true both of the brightest virtues and the blackest vices, though they seem to set apart their possessors from the rest of mankind, that the seeds of them are sown in every human breast. The man, who attracts and awes us by his intellectual and moral grandeur, is only an example and anticipation of the improvements, for which every mind was endowed with reason and conscience; and the worst man has become such by the perversion and excess of desires and appetites which he shares with his whole race. Napoleon had no element of character which others do not possess. It was his misery and guilt that he was usurped and absorbed by one passion; that his whole mind shot up into one growth; that his singular strength of thought and will, which, if consecrated to virtue, would have enrolled him among the benefactors of mankind, was enslaved by one lust. He is not to be gazed on as a prodigy. He was a manifestation of our own nature. He teaches on a large scale what thousands teach on a narrow one. He shows us the greatness of the ruin, which is wrought when the order of the mind is subverted, conscience dethroned, and a strong passion left without restraint to turn every inward and outward resource to the accomplishment of a selfish purpose.

The influence of the *love of power* on human affairs is so constant, unbounded, and tremendous, that we think this princi-

* Vol. IV. No. V. p. 382.

ple of our nature worthy of distinct consideration, and shall devote to it a few pages, as a fit sequel to our notice of Bonaparte.

The passion for power is one of the most universal, nor is it to be regarded as a crime in all its forms. Sweeping censures on a natural sentiment cast blame on the Creator. This principle shows itself in the very dawn of our existence. The child never exults and rejoices more, than when it becomes conscious of power by overcoming difficulties, or compassing new ends. All our desires and appetites lend aid and energy to this passion, for all find increase of gratification, in proportion to our increase of power. We ought to add, that this principle is fed from nobler sources. Power is a chief element of all the commanding qualities of our nature. It enters into all the higher virtues; such as magnanimity, fortitude, constancy. It enters into intellectual eminence. It is power of thought and utterance which immortalizes the products of genius. Is it strange that an attribute, through which all our passions reach their objects, and which characterises whatever is great or admirable in man, should awaken intense desire, and be sought as one of the chief goods of life?

The love of power, we have said, is not in all its forms a crime. There are indeed various kinds of power, which it is our duty to covet, accumulate, and hold fast. First, there is *inward* power, the most precious of all possessions; power over ourselves; power to withstand trial, to bear suffering, to front danger; power over pleasure and pain; power to follow our convictions, however resisted by menace or scorn; the power of calm reliance in seasons of darkness and storms. Again, there is a power over *outward* things; the power by which the mind triumphs over matter, presses into its service the subtlest and strongest elements, makes the winds, fire, and steam its ministers, rears the city, opens a path through the ocean, and makes the wilderness blossom as the rose. These forms of power, especially the first, are glorious distinctions of our race, nor can we prize them too highly.

There is another power, which is our principal concern in the present discussion. We mean power over our fellow creatures. It is this which ambition chiefly covets, and which has instigated to more crime, and spread more misery than any other cause. We are not however to condemn even this universally. There is a truly noble sway of man over man; one, which it is our honor to seek and exert; which is earned by well doing; which is a chief recompense of virtue. We refer to the quick-

ening influence of a good and great mind over other minds, by which it brings them into sympathy with itself. Far from condemning this, we are anxious to hold it forth as the purest glory which virtuous ambition can propose. The power of awakening, enlightening, elevating our fellow creatures, may, with peculiar fitness, be called divine; for there is no agency of God so beneficent and sublime, as that which he exerts on rational natures, and by which he assimilates them to himself. This quickening power over other minds is the surest test of greatness. We admire indeed the energy, which subdues the material creation, or developes the physical resources of a state. But it is a nobler might which calls forth the intellectual and moral resources of a people, which communicates new impulses to society, throws into circulation new and stirring thoughts, gives the mind a new consciousness of its faculties, and rouses and fortifies the will to an unconquerable purpose of well doing. This spiritual power is worth all other. To improve man's outward condition is a secondary agency, and is chiefly important as it gives the means of inward growth. The most glorious minister of God on earth, is he who speaks with a life-giving energy to other minds, breathing into them the love of truth and virtue, strengthening them to suffer in a good cause, and lifting them above the senses and the world.

We know not a more exhilarating thought, than that this power is given to men; that we can not only change the face of the outward world, and by virtuous discipline improve ourselves, but that we may become springs of life and light to our fellow beings. We are thus admitted to a fellowship with Jesus Christ, whose highest end was, that he might act with a new and celestial energy on the human mind. We rejoice to think, that he did not come to monopolize this divine sway, to enjoy a solitary grandeur, but to receive others, even all who should obey his religion, into the partnership of this honor and happiness. Every Christian, in proportion to his progress, acquires a measure of this divine agency. In the humblest conditions, a power goes forth from a devout and disinterested spirit, calling forth silently moral and religious sentiment, perhaps in a child, or some other friend, and teaching, without the aid of words, the loveliness and peace of sincere and single hearted virtue. In the more enlightened classes, individuals now and then rise up, who, through a singular force and elevation of soul, obtain a sway over men's minds to which no limit can be prescribed. They speak with a voice which is heard by distant nations, and which goes down to future ages. Their names are repeated with vene-

ration by millions, and millions read in their lives and writings a quickening testimony to the greatness of the mind, to its moral strength, to the reality of disinterested virtue. These are the true sovereigns of the earth. They share in the royalty of Jesus Christ. They have a greatness which will be more and more felt. The time is coming, its signs are visible, when this long mistaken attribute of greatness, will be seen to belong eminently, if not exclusively, to those, who, by their characters, deeds, sufferings, writings, leave imperishable and ennobling traces of themselves on the human mind. Among these legitimate sovereigns of the world, will be ranked the philosopher, who penetrates the secrets of the universe, and opens new fields to the intellect; who spreads enlarged and liberal habits of thought, and who helps men to understand, that an ever growing knowledge is the patrimony destined for them by the 'Father of their Spirits.' Among them will be ranked the statesman, who, escaping a vulgar policy, rises to the discovery of the true interest of a state; who understands that a nation's mind is more valuable than its soil; who inspirits a people's enterprise, without making them the slaves of wealth; who looks for his glory to posterity, and is mainly anxious to originate or give stability to institutions by which society may be carried forward. Among these will be ranked, perhaps on the highest throne, the moral and religious Reformer, who truly merits that name; who rises above the spirit of his times; who is moved by a holy impulse to assail vicious establishments, sustained by fierce passions and inveterate prejudices; who rescues great truths from the corruptions of ages; who, joining calm and deep thought to profound feeling, secures to religion at once enlightened and earnest conviction; who unfolds to men higher forms of virtue than they have yet attained or conceived; who gives brighter and more thrilling views of the perfection for which they were framed, and inspires a victorious faith in the perpetual progress of our nature.

There is one characteristic of this power which belongs to truly great minds, particularly deserving notice. Far from enslaving, it makes more and more free, those on whom it is exercised; and in this respect it differs wholly from the vulgar sway which ambition thirsts for. It awakens a kindred power in others, calls their faculties into new life, and particularly strengthens them to follow their own deliberate convictions of truth and duty. It breathes conscious energy, selfrespect, moral independence, and a scorn of every foreign yoke.

There in another power over men, very different from this; a

power, not to quicken and elevate, but to crush and subdue; a power which robs men of the free use of their nature, takes them out of their own hands, and compels them to bend to another's will. This is the sway which men grasp at most eagerly, and which it is our great purpose to expose. To reign, to give laws, to clothe their own wills with omnipotence, to annihilate all other wills, to spoil the individual of that selfdirection which is his most precious right; this has ever been deemed by multitudes the highest prize for competition and conflict. The most envied men are those, who have succeeded in prostrating multitudes, in subjecting whole communities, to their single will. It is the love of this power, in all its forms, which we are anxious to hold up to reprobation. If any crime should be placed by society beyond pardon, it is this.

This power has been exerted most conspicuously and perniciously by two classes of men; the priest or minister of religion, and the civil ruler. Both rely on the same instruments; that is, pain or terror; the first calling to his aid the fires and torments of the future world, and practising on the natural dread of invisible powers, and the latter availing himself of chains, dungeons, and gibbets in the present life. Through these terrible applications, man has in all ages and in almost every country been made, in a greater or less degree, a slave and machine; been shackled in all his faculties, and degraded into a tool of others' wills and passions. The influence of almost every political and religious institution has been to make man abject in mind, fearful, servile, a mechanical repeater of opinions which he dares not try, and a contributor of his toil, sweat, and blood to governments which never dreamed of the general weal as their only legitimate end. On the immense majority of men, thus wronged and enslaved, the consciousness of their own nature has not yet dawned; and the doctrine, that each has a mind, worth more than the material world, and framed to grow forever by a selfforming, selfdirecting energy, is still a secret, a mystery, notwithstanding the clear annunciation of it, ages ago, by Jesus Christ. We know not a stronger proof of the intenseness and nefariousness of the love of power, than the fact of its having virtually abrogated Christianity, and even turned into an engine of dominion, a revelation which breathes throughout the spirit of freedom, proclaims the essential equality of the human race, and directs its most solemn denunciations against the passion for rule and empire.

That this power, which consists in force and compulsion, in the imposition on the many of the will and judgment of one or

a few, is of a low order, when compared with the quickening influence over others, of which we have before spoken, we need not stop to prove. But the remark is less obvious, though not less true, that it is not only inferior in kind, but in amount or degree. This may not be so easily acknowledged. He, whose will is passively obeyed by a nation, or whose creed implicitly adopted by a spreading sect, may not easily believe, that his power is exceeded, not only in kind or quality, but in extent, by him who wields only the silent, subtle influence of moral and intellectual gifts. But the superiority of moral to arbitrary sway in this particular, is proved by its effects. Moral power is creative; arbitrary power wastes away the spirit and force of those on whom it is exerted. And is it not a mightier work to create than to destroy? A higher energy is required to quicken than to crush; to elevate than to depress; to warm and expand than to chill and contract. Any hand, even the weakest, may take away life. Another agency is required to kindle or restore it. A vulgar incendiary may destroy in an hour a magnificent structure, the labor of ages. Has he energy to be compared with the creative intellect, in which this work had its origin? A fanatic of ordinary talent may send terror through a crowd; and by the craft, which is so often joined with fanaticism, may fasten on multitudes a debasing creed. Has he power to be compared with him, who rescues from darkness one only of these enslaved minds, and quickens it to think justly and nobly in relation to God, duty, and immortality? The energies of a single soul, awakened, by such an influence, to the free and full use of its powers, may surpass, in their progress, the intellectual activity of a whole community, enchained and debased by fanaticism or outward force. Arbitrary power, whether civil or religious, if tried by the only fair test, that is, by its effects, seems to have more affinity with weakness than strength. It enfeebles and narrows what it acts upon. Its efficiency resembles that of darkness and cold in the natural world. True power is vivifying, productive, builds up, and gives strength. We have a noble type and manifestation of it in the sun, which calls forth and diffuses motion, life, energy, and beauty. He who succeeds in chaining men's understandings and breaking their wills, may indeed number millions as his subjects. But a weak, puny race are the products of his sway, and they can only reach the stature and force of men by throwing off his yoke. He who, by an intellectual and moral energy, awakens kindred energy in others, touches springs of infinite might, gives impulse to faculties to which no bounds can be prescribed, begins an action which will

never end. One great and kindling thought from a retired and obscure man, may live when thrones are fallen, and the memory of those who filled them obliterated, and like an undying fire, may illuminate and quicken all future generations.

We have spoken of the inferiority and worthlessness of that dominion over others, which has been coveted so greedily in all ages. We should rejoice could we convey some just idea of its moral turpitude. Of all injuries and crimes, the most flagrant is chargeable on him, who aims to establish dominion over his brethren. He wars with what is more precious than life. He would rob men of their chief prerogative and glory; we mean of selfdominion, of that empire which is given to a rational and moral being over his own soul and his own life. Such a being is framed to find honor and happiness in forming and swaying himself, in adopting as his supreme standard his convictions of truth and duty, in unfolding his powers by free exertion, in acting from a principle within, from his growing conscience. His proper and noblest attributes are selfgovernment, selfreverence, energy of thought, energy in choosing the right and the good, energy in casting off all other dominion. He was created for empire in his own breast, and wo, wo to them who would pluck from him this sceptre. A mind, inspired by God with reason and conscience, and capable, through these endowments, of progress in truth and duty, is a sacred thing; more sacred than temples made with hands, or even than this outward universe. It is of nobler lineage than that of which human aristocracy makes its boast. It bears the lineaments of a Divine Parent. It has not only a physical, but moral connexion with the Supreme Being. Through its selfdetermining power, it is accountable for its deeds, and for whatever it becomes. Responsibiltiy, that which above all things makes existence solemn, is laid upon it. Its great end is to conform itself, by its own energy, and by spiritual succors which its own prayers and faithfulness secure, to that perfection of wisdom and goodness, of which God is the original and source, which shines upon us from the whole outward world, but of which the intelligent soul is a truer recipient and a brighter image, even than the sun with all his splendors. From these views we learn, that no outrage, no injury, can equal that, which is perpetrated by him, who would break down and subjugate the human mind; who would rob men of selfreverence; who would bring them to stand more in awe of outward authority, than of reason and conscience in their own souls; who would make himself a standard and law

for his race, and shape, by force or terror, the free spirits of others after his own judgment and will.

All excellence, whether intellectual or moral, involves, as its essential elements, freedom, energy, and moral independence. So that the invader of these, whether from the throne or the pulpit, invades the most sacred interest of the human race. Intellectual excellence implies and requires these. This does not consist in passive assent even to the highest truths; or in the most extensive stores of knowledge acquired by an implicit faith, and lodged in the inert memory. It lies in force, freshness, and independence of thought; and is most conspicuously manifested by him, who, loving truth supremely, seeks it resolutely, follows the light without fear, and modifies the views of others by the patient, strenuous exercise of his own faculties. To a man thus intellectually free, truth is not, what it is to passive multitudes, a foreign substance, dormant, lifeless, fruitless, but penetrating, prolific, full of vitality, and ministering to the health and expansion of the soul. And what we have said of intellectual excellence is still more true of moral. This has its foundation and root in freedom, and cannot exist a moment without it. The very idea of virtue is, that it is a free act, the product or result of the mind's selfdetermining power. It is not good feeling, infused by nature or caught by sympathy; nor is it good conduct into which we have slidden through imitation, or which has been forced upon us by another's will. We ourselves are its authors in a high and peculiar sense. We indeed depend on God for virtue. Our capacity for it is wholly his gift and inspiration, and without his perpetual aid this capacity would avail nothing. But his aid is not compulsion. He respects, he cannot violate, that moral freedom which is his richest gift. To the individual, the decision of his own character is left. He has more than kingly power in his own soul. Let him never resign it. Let none dare to interfere with it. Virtue is selfdominion, or what is the same thing, it is selfsubjection to the principle of duty, that highest law in the soul. If these views of intellectual and moral excellence be just, then to invade men's freedom is to aim the deadliest blow at their honor and happiness; and their worst foe is he who fetters their reason, who makes his will their law, who makes them tools, echoes, copies of himself.

Perhaps it may be objected to the representation of virtue as consisting in selfdominion, that the scriptures speak of it as consisting in obedience to God. But these are perfectly compatible and harmonious views; for genuine obedience to God is the

free choice and adoption of a law, the great principles of which our own minds approve, and our own consciences bind on us; which is not an arbitrary injunction, but an emanation and expression of the Divine mind; and which is intended throughout to give energy, dignity, and enlargement to our best powers. He, and he only, obeys God virtuously and acceptably, who reverences right, not power; who has chosen rectitude as his supreme rule; who sees and reveres in God the fulness and brightness of moral excellence, and who sees in obedience the progress and perfection of his own nature. That subjection to the Deity, which, we fear, is too common, in which the mind surrenders itself to mere power and will, is anything but virtue. We fear that it is disloyalty to that moral principle, which is ever to be reverenced as God's vicegerent in the rational soul.

Perhaps some may fear, that, in our zeal for the freedom and independence of the individual mind, we unsettle government, and almost imply that it is a wrong. Far from it. We hold government to be an essential means of our intellectual and moral education, and would strengthen it by pointing out its legitimate functions. Government, as far as it is rightful, is the guardian and friend of freedom, so that in exalting the one we enforce the other. The highest aim of all authority is to confer liberty. This is true of domestic rule. The great, we may say the single object of parental government, of a wise and virtuous education, is, to give the child the fullest use of his own powers; to give him inward force; to train him up to govern himself. The same is true of the authority of Jesus Christ. He came, indeed, to rule mankind; but to rule them, not by arbitrary statutes, not by force and menace, not by mere will, but by setting before them, in precept and life, those everlasting rules of rectitude, which Heaven obeys, and of which every soul contains the living germs. He came to exert a moral power; to reign by the manifestation of celestial virtues; to awaken the energy of holy purpose in the free mind. He came to publish liberty to the captives; to open the prison door; to break the power of the passions; to break the yoke of a ceremonial religion which had been imposed in the childhood of the race; to exalt us to a manly homage and obedience of our Creator. Of civil government, too, the great end is to secure freedom. Its proper, and highest function is, to watch over the liberties of each and all, and to open to a community the widest field for all its powers. Its very chains and prisons have the general freedom for their aim. They are just, only when used to curb oppression and wrong; to disarm him who has a tyrant's heart, if not a tyrant's

power, who wars against others' rights, who, by invading property or life, would substitute force for the reign of equal laws. Freedom, we repeat it, is the end of government. To exalt men to selfrule is the end of all other rule, and he who would fasten on them his arbitrary will is their worst foe.

We have aimed to show the guilt of the love of power and dominion, by showing the ruin which it brings on the mind, by enlarging on the preciousness of that inward freedom which it invades and destroys. To us, this view is the most impressive; but the guilt of this passion may also be discerned, and by some more clearly, in its outward influences; in the desolation, bloodshed, and woe, of which it is the perpetual cause. We owe to it almost all the miseries of war. To spread the sway of one or a few, thousands and millions have been turned into machines under the name of soldiers, armed with instruments of destruction, and then sent to reduce others to their own lot by fear and pain, by fire and sword, by butchery and pillage. And is it light guilt, to array man against his brother; to make murder the trade of thousands; to drench the earth with human blood; to turn it into a desert; to scatter families like chaff; to make mothers widows, and children orphans; and to do all this for the purpose of spreading a still gloomier desolation, for the purpose of subjugating men's souls, turning them into base parasites, extorting from them a degrading homage, humbling them in their own eyes, and breaking them to servility as the chief duty of life? When the passion for power succeeds, as it generally has done, in establishing despotism, it seems to make even civilisation a doubtful good. Whilst the monarch and his court are abandoned to a wasteful luxury, the peasantry, rooted to the soil and doomed to a perpetual round of labors, are raised but little above the brute. There are parts of Europe, christian Europe, in which the peasant, through whose sweat kings and nobles riot in plenty, seems to enjoy less, on the whole, than the untamed Indian of our forests. Chained to one spot, living on the cheapest vegetables, sometimes unable to buy salt to season his coarse fare, seldom or never tasting animal food, having for his shelter a mud walled hut floored with earth or stone, and subjected equally with the brute to the rule of a superior, he seems to us to partake less of animal, intellectual, and moral pleasures, than the free wanderer of the woods, whose steps no man fetters; whose wigwam no tyrant violates; whose chief toil is hunting, that noblest of sports; who feasts on the deer, that most luxurious of viands; to whom streams, as well as woods, pay tribute; whose adventurous life gives sagacity; and in whom peril nour-

ishes courage and selfcommand. We are no advocates for savage life. We know that its boasted freedom is a delusion. The single fact that human nature in this wild state makes no progress, is proof enough that it wants true liberty. We mean only to say that man in the hands of despotism is sometimes degraded below the savage; that it were better for him to be lawless, than to live under lawless sway.

It is the part of Christians to look on the passion for power and dominion with strong abhorrence; for it is singularly hostile to the genius of their religion. Jesus Christ always condemned it. One of the striking marks of his moral greatness, and of the originality of his character, was, that he held no fellowship and made no compromise with this universal spirit of his age, but withstood it in every form. He found the Jews intoxicating themselves with dreams of empire. Of the prophecies relating to the Messiah, the most familiar and dear to them, were those which announced him as a conqueror, and which were construed by their worldliness into a promise of triumphs to the people, from whom he was to spring. Even the chosen disciples of Jesus looked to him for this good. 'To sit on his right hand and on his left,' or, in other words, to hold the most commanding stations in his kingdom, was not only their lurking wish, but their open and importunate request. But there was no passion on which Jesus frowned more severely than on this. He taught, that to be great in his kingdom, men must serve, instead of ruling, their brethren. He placed among them a child as an emblem of the humility of his religion. His most terrible rebukes fell on the lordly, aspiring Pharisee. In his own person, he was mild and condescending, exacting no personal service, living with his disciples as a friend, sharing their wants, sleeping in their fishing boat, and even washing their feet; and in all this, he expressly proposed himself to them as a pattern, knowing well, that the last triumph of disinterestedness is to forget our own superiority, in our sympathy, solicitude, tenderness, respect, and selfdenying zeal for those who are below us. We cannot indeed wonder that the lust of power should be encountered by the sternest rebukes and menace of Christianity, because it wages open war with the great end of this religion, which is the elevation of the human mind. No corruption of this religion is more palpable and more enormous, than that which turns it into an instrument of dominion, and which makes it teach, that man's primary duty is to give himself a passive material into the hands of his minister, priest, or king.

The subject which we now discuss is one in which all nations

have an interest, and especially our own; and we should fail of our main purpose, were we not to lead our readers to apply it to ourselves. The passion for ruling, though most completely developed in despotisms, is confined to no forms of government. It is the chief peril of free states, the natural enemy of free institutions. It agitates our own country, and still throws an uncertainty over the great experiment we are making here in behalf of liberty. We will try then, in a few words, to expose its influences and dangers, and to abate that zeal with which a participation in office and power is sought among ourselves.

It is the distinction of republican institutions, that whilst they compel the passion for power to moderate its pretensions, and to satisfy itself with more limited gratifications, they tend to spread it more widely through the community, and to make it a universal principle. The doors of office being opened to all, crowds burn to rush in. A thousand hands are stretched out to grasp the reins which are denied to none. Perhaps in this boasted and boasting land of liberty, not a few, if called to state the chief good of a republic, would place it in this; that every man is eligible to every office, and that the highest places of power and trust are prizes for universal competition. The superiority attributed by many to our institutions, is, not that they secure the greatest freedom, but give every man a chance of ruling; not that they reduce the power of government within the narrowest limits which the safety of the state admits, but throw it into as many hands as possible. The despot's great crime is thought to be, that he keeps the delight of dominion to himself, that he makes a monopoly of it, whilst our more generous institutions, by breaking it into parcels, and inviting the multitude to scramble for it, spread this joy more widely. The result is, that political ambition infects our country, and generates a feverish restlessness and discontent, which, to the monarchist, may seem more than a balance for our forms of liberty. The spirit of intrigue, which in absolute governments is confined to courts, walks abroad through the land; and as individuals can accomplish no political purposes single handed, they band themselves into parties, ostensibly framed for public ends, but aiming only at the acquisition of power. The nominal sovereign, that is, the people, like all other sovereigns, is courted and flattered, and told that it can do no wrong. Its pride is pampered, its passions inflamed, its prejudices made inveterate. Such are the processes, by which other republics have been subverted, and he must be blind who cannot trace them among ourselves.

We mean not to exaggerate our dangers. We rejoice to know, that the improvements of society oppose many checks to the love of power. But every wise man, who sees its workings, must dread it as our chief foe.

This passion derives strength and vehemence in our country from the common idea, that political power is the highest prize which society has to offer. We know not a more general delusion, nor is it the least dangerous. Instilled, as it is, in our youth, it gives infinite excitement to political ambition. It turns the active talent of the country to public station as the supreme good, and makes it restless, intriguing, and unprincipled. It calls out hosts of selfish competitors for the comparatively few places, and encourages a bold, unblushing pursuit of personal elevation, which a just moral sense and selfrespect in the community would frown upon and cover with shame. This prejudice has come down from past ages, and is one of their worst bequests. To govern others has always been thought the highest function on earth. We have a remarkable proof of the strength and pernicious influence of this persuasion, in the manner in which history has been written. Who fill the page of history? Political and military leaders, who have lived for one end, to subdue and govern their fellow beings. These occupy the foreground; and the people, the human race, dwindle into insignificance, and are almost lost behind their masters. The proper and noblest object of history, is, to record the vicissitudes of society, its spirit in different ages, the causes which have determined its progress and decline, and especially the manifestation and growth of its highest attributes and interests, of intelligence, of the religious principle, of moral sentiment, of the elegant and useful arts, of the triumphs of man over nature and himself. Instead of this, we have records of men in power, often weak, oftener wicked, who did little or nothing for the advancement of their age, who were in no sense its representatives, whom the accident of birth perhaps raised to influence. We have the quarrels of courtiers, the intrigues of cabinets, sieges and battles, royal births and deaths, and the secrets of a palace, that sink of lewdness and corruption. These are the staples of history. The inventions of printing, of gunpowder, and the mariner's compass, were too mean affairs for history to trace. She was bowing before kings and warriors. She had volumes for the plots and quarrels of Leicester and Essex in the reign of Elizabeth, but not a page for Shakspeare; and if Bacon had not filled an office, she would hardly have recorded his name, in her anxiety to preserve the deeds and sayings of that Solomon of his age, James the First.

We have spoken of the supreme importance which is attached to rulers and government, as a prejudice; and we think, that something may be done towards abating the passion for power, by placing this thought in a clearer light. It seems to us not very difficult to show, that to govern men is not as high a sphere of action as has been commonly supposed, and that those who have obtained this dignity, have usurped a place beyond their due in history and men's minds. We apprehend, indeed, that we are not alone in this opinion; that a change of sentiment on this subject has commenced and must go on; that men are learning that there are higher sources of happiness and more important agents in human affairs than political rule. It is one mark of the progress of society, that it brings down the public man and raises the private one. It throws power into the hands of untitled individuals, and spreads it through all orders of the community. It multiplies and distributes freely means of extensive influence, and opens new channels, by which the gifted mind, in whatever rank or condition, may communicate itself far and wide. Through the diffusion of education and printing, a private man may now speak to multitudes, incomparably more numerous, than ancient or modern eloquence ever electrified in the popular assembly or the hall of legislation. By these instruments, truth is asserting her sovereignty over nations, without the help of rank, office, or sword; and her faithful ministers will become more and more the lawgivers of the world.

We mean not to deny, we steadily affirm, that government is a great good, and essential to human happiness; but it does its good chiefly by a negative influence, by repressing injustice and crime, by securing property from invasion, and thus removing obstructions to the free exercise of human powers. It confers little positive benefit. Its office is, not to confer happiness, but to give men opportunity to work out happiness for themselves. Government resembles the wall which surrounds our lands; a needful protection, but rearing no harvests, ripening no fruits. It is the individual who must choose whether the enclosure shall be a paradise or a waste. How little positive good can government confer? It does not till our fields, build our houses, weave the ties which bind us to our families, give disinterestedness to the heart, or energy to the intellect and will. All our great interests are left to ourselves; and governments, when they have interferred with them, have obstructed, much more than advanced them. For example, they have taken religion into their keeping only to disfigure it. So education, in their hands, has generally become a propagator of servile maxims, and an

upholder of antiquated errors. In like manner they have paralysed trade by their nursing care, and multiplied poverty by expedients for its relief. Government has almost always been a barrier against which intellect has had to struggle; and society has made its chief progress by the minds of private individuals, who have outstripped their rulers, and gradually shamed them into truth and wisdom.

Virtue and intelligence are the great interests of a community, including all others, and worth all others; and the noblest agency is that by which they are advanced. Now we apprehend, that political power is not the most effectual instrument for their promotion, and accordingly we doubt whether government is the only or highest sphere for superior minds. Virtue, from its very nature, cannot be a product of what may be called the direct operation of government, that is, of legislation. Laws may repress crime. Their office is to erect prisons for violence and fraud. But moral and religious worth, dignity of character, loftiness of sentiment, all that makes man a blessing to himself and society, lies beyond their province. Virtue is of the soul, where laws cannot penetrate. Excellence is something too refined, spiritual, celestial, to be produced by the coarse machinery of government. Human legislation addresses itself to self-love, and works by outward force. Its chief instrument is punishment. It cannot touch the springs of virtuous feelings, of great and good deeds. Accordingly, rulers, with all their imagined omnipotence, do not dream of enjoining by statute, philanthropy, gratitude, devout sentiment, magnanimity, and purity of thought. Virtue is too high a concern for government. It is an inspiration of God, not a creature of law; and the agents whom God chiefly honors in its promotion, are those, who, through experience as well as meditation, have risen to generous conceptions of it, and who show it forth, not in empty eulogies, but in the language of deep conviction, and in lives of purity.

Government then does little to advance the chief interest of human nature by its direct agency; and what shall we say of its indirect? Here we wish not to offend; but we must be allowed to use that plainness of speech which becomes Christians and freemen. We do fear then, that the indirect influence of government is on the whole adverse to virtue; and in saying this, we do not speak of other countries, or of different political institutions from our own. We do not mean to say, what all around us would echo, that monarchy corrupts a state, that the air of a court reeks with infection, and taints the higher classes with a licentiousness which descends to their inferiors. We speak of government at

home; and we ask wise men to say, whether it ministers most to vice or virtue. We fear, that here, as elsewhere, political power is of corrupting tendency; and that, generally speaking, public men are not the most effectual teachers of truth, disinterestedness, and incorruptible integrity to the people. An error prevails in relation to political concerns, which necessarily makes civil institutions demoralizing. It is deeply rooted, the growth of ages. We refer to the belief, that public men are absolved in a measure from the everlasting and immutable obligations of morality; that political power is a prize, which justifies arts and compliances that would be scorned in private life; that management, intrigue, hollow pretensions, and appeals to base passions, deserve slight rebuke when employed to compass political ends. Accordingly the laws of truth, justice, and philanthropy, have seldom been applied to public as to private concerns. Even those individuals, who have come to frown indignantly on the machinations, the office seeking, and the sacrifices to popularity, which disgrace our internal condition, are disposed to acquiesce in a crooked or ungenerous policy towards foreign nations, by which great advantages may accrue to their own country. Now the great truth on which the cause of virtue rests, is, that rectitude is an eternal, unalterable, and universal law, binding at once heaven and earth, the perfection of God's character, and the harmony and happiness of the rational creation; and in proportion as political institutions unsettle this great conviction—in proportion as they teach that truth, justice, and philanthropy are local, partial obligations, claiming homage from the weak, but shrinking before the powerful—in proportion at they thus insult the awful and inviolable majesty of the Eternal Law—in the same proportion they undermine the very foundation of a people's virtue.

In regard to the other great interest of the community, its intelligence, government may do much good by a direct influence; that is, by instituting schools or appropriating revenue for the instruction of the poorer classes. Whether it would do wisely in assuming to itself, or in taking from individuals, the provision and care of higher literary institutions, is a question not easily determined. But no one will doubt, that it is a noble function, to assist and develope the intellect in those classes of the community, whose hard condition exposes them to a merely animal existence. Still the agency of government in regard to knowledge is necessarily superficial and narrow. The great sources of intellectual power and progress to a people, are its strong and original thinkers, be they found where they may. Government

cannot, and does not, extend the bounds of knowledge; cannot make experiments in the laboratory, explore the laws of animal or vegetable nature, or establish the principles of criticism, morals, and religion. The energy which is to carry forward the intellect of a people, belongs chiefly to private individuals, who devote themselves to lonely thought, who worship truth, who originate the views demanded by their age, who help us to throw off the yoke of established prejudices, who improve on old modes of education or invent better. It is true that great men at the head of affairs, may, and often do, contribute much to the growth of a nation's mind. But it too often happens that their station obstructs rather than aids their usefulness. Their connexion with a party, and the habit of viewing subjects in reference to personal aggrandizement, too often obscure the noblest intellects, and convert into patrons of narrow views and temporary interests, those, who, in other conditions, would have been the lights of their age, and the propagators of everlasting truth.——From these views of the limited influence of government on the most precious interests of society, we learn that political power is not the noblest power, and that, in the progress of intelligence, it will cease to be coveted as the chief and most honorable distinction on earth.

If we pass now to the consideration of that interest, over which government is expected chiefly to watch, and on which it is most competent to act with power, we shall not arrive at a result very different from what we have just expressed. We refer to property, or wealth. That the influence of political institutions on this great concern is important, inestimable, we mean not to deny. But as we have already suggested, it is chiefly negative. Government enriches a people by removing obstructions to their powers, by defending them from wrong, and thus giving them opportunity to enrich themselves. Government is not the spring of the wealth of nations, but their own sagacity, industry, enterprise, and force of character. To leave a people to themselves, is generally the best service their rulers can render. Time was, when sovereigns fixed prices and wages, regulated industry and expense, and imagined that a nation would starve and perish, if it were not guided and guarded like an infant. But we have learned, that men are their own best guardians, that property is safest under its owner's care, and that generally speaking, even great enterprises can better be accomplished by the voluntary association of individuals, than by the state. Indeed, we are met at every stage of this discussion by the truth, that political power is a weak engine compared with *individual*

intelligence, virtue, and effort; and we are the more anxious to enforce this truth, because, through an extravagant estimate of government, men are apt to expect from it what they must do for themselves, and to throw upon it the blame which belongs to their own feebleness and improvidence. The great hope of society, is individual character. Civilisation and political institutions are themselves sources of not a few evils, which nothing but the intellectual and moral energy of the private citizen can avert or relieve. Such, for example, are the monstrous inequalities of property, the sad contrasts of condition, which disfigure a large city; which laws create and cannot remove; which can only be mitigated and diminished by a principle of moral restraint in the poorer classes, and by a wise beneficence in the rich. The great lesson for men to learn, is, that their happiness is in their own hands; that it is to be wrought out by their own faithfulness to God and conscience; that no outward institutions can supply the place of inward principle, of moral energy, whilst this can go far to supply the place of almost every outward aid.

Our remarks will show that our estimate of political institutions, is more moderate than the prevalent one, and that we regard the power, for which ambition has woven so many plots and shed so much blood, as destined to occupy a more and more narrow space, among the means of usefulness and distinction. There is, however, one branch of government, which we hold in high veneration, which we account an unspeakable blessing, and which, for the world, we would not say a word to disparage; and we are the more disposed to speak of it, because its relative importance seems to us little understood. We refer to the Judiciary, a department worth all others in the state. Whilst politicians expend their zeal on transient interests, which perhaps derive their chief importance from their connexion with a party, it is the province of the Judge to apply those solemn and universal laws of rectitude, on which the security, industry, and prosperity of the individual and the state essentially depend. From his tribunal, as from a sacred oracle, go forth the responses of justice. To us there is nothing in the whole fabric of civil institutions so interesting and imposing, as this authoritative exposition of the everlasting principles of moral legislation. The administration of justice in this country, where the Judge, without a guard, without a soldier, without pomp, decides upon the dearest interests of the citizen, trusting chiefly to the moral sentiment of the community for the execution of his decrees, is the most beautiful and encouraging aspect, under which our government can be viewed. We repeat it, there is nothing in public

affairs so venerable as the voice of Justice, speaking through her delegated ministers, reaching and subduing the high as well as the low, setting a defence around the splendid mansion of wealth and the lowly hut of poverty, repressing wrong, vindicating innocence, humbling the oppressor, and publishing the rights of human nature to every human being. We confess, that we often turn with pain and humiliation from the hall of Congress where we see the legislator forgetting the majesty of his function, forgetting his relation to a vast and growing community, and sacrificing to his party or to himself the public weal; and it comforts us to turn to the court of justice, where the dispenser of the laws, shutting his ear against all solicitations of friendship or interest, dissolving for a time every private tie, forgetting public opinion, and withstanding public feeling, asks only what is RIGHT. To our courts, the resorts and refuge of weakness and innocence, we look with hope and joy. We boast, with a virtuous pride, that no breath of corruption has as yet tainted their pure air. To this department of government, we cannot ascribe too much importance. Over this, we cannot watch too jealously. Every encroachment on its independence we should resent, and repel, as the chief wrong our country can sustain. Wo, wo to the impious hand, which would shake this most sacred and precious column of the social edifice.

In the remarks which we have now submitted to our readers, we have treated of great topics, if not worthily, yet, we trust, with a pure purpose. We have aimed to expose the passion for dominion, the desire of ruling mankind. We have labored to show the superiority of moral power and influence to that sway which has for ages been seized with eager and bloody hands. We have labored to hold up to unmeasured reprobation, him who would establish an empire of brute force over rational beings. We have labored to hold forth, as the enemy of his race, the man who, in any way, would fetter the human mind, and subject other wills to his own. In a word, we have desired to awaken others and ourselves, to a just selfreverence, to the free use and expansion of our highest powers, and especially to that moral force, that energy of holy, virtuous purpose, without which we are slaves amidst the freest institutions. Better gifts than these we cannot supplicate from God; nor can we consecrate our lives to nobler acquisitions.

ART. VI.—*Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Opinions of the Rev. Samuel Parr, LL. D. with Biographical Notices of many of his Friends, Pupils, and Contemporaries.* By the REV. WILLIAM FIELD. In two volumes, 8vo. Vol. I. London. 1828.

THE name of Dr Parr has long stood high among literary men, and his death has been the signal for a multitude of writers to publish to the world their anecdotes of his life, character, and manners, and to repeat his strong and pointed sayings. Mr Field's work, of which only one volume has yet appeared, is, we believe, the most ponderous, and lays claim to authenticity on the score of his long and intimate acquaintance with its subject. It was very characteristic of the Doctor, that, in his cool persuasion of his own importance to the world, he made a deliberate appointment of his biographer, who, like another Boswell, should convey to posterity the history of this second Johnson. From some unexplained cause, his wishes have not been executed, and Mr Field has volunteered to administer on the reputation of his deceased friend. He is not quite a Boswell, either in minuteness, entertainment, egotism, or blind partiality for the subject of his narrative. His book does not wholly satisfy us, not being sufficiently neat and compact in its execution. Yet we have read it with great interest. It is apparently impartial, presents a good picture of Dr Parr's character, talents, and manners, and contains numerous specimens of that peculiar style by which he was distinguished, and on which his literary fame so much rested. The uncommon vigor of his mind, his unquestionable attainments, his real excellence of heart, integrity of principle, and liberality of sentiment, are set forth fairly, but not in language of indiscriminating panegyric; and his palpable imperfections, his eccentricities, his egotism, and pompous selfconceit, are neither disguised nor excused. These latter traits, prominent as they were, are referred for their origin, with no small degree of probability, to the extravagant adulation, which, when quite a boy, he received from his parents' injudicious friends, when they made the young wonder speak orations at the table, and encouraged him to enter the lists with grown up men, in contests of pertness and wit. The confident selfsatisfaction of manner which was thus produced, displayed itself sometimes so unconsciously, in a mode so indescribably *naïf* and innocent, as to disarm all feelings of displeasure or disgust; as, for example, when, on the death of his favorite daughter, he wrote and published a notice of her char-

acter, in which he said; 'Her venerable father, *whose attainments are exceeded only by the strength of his understanding and the warmth of his heart*, will long and deeply feel and lament her loss.'

As Dr Parr was distinguished rather as a scholar than as a theologian, and his connexions were formed rather in the literary than the religious world, his biography is principally occupied with anecdotes of his literary pursuits and his intercourse with men of letters. Yet he is represented by Mr Field as having been faithful in the humble duties of his village charge, and a good and powerful preacher. It was his general practice to speak extempore, and 'he often broke forth into a strain of fervid and forcible, and sometimes even sublime eloquence, by which his whole audience were astonished and enraptured.'

His candor and liberality respecting religious differences, made an important feature of his character, and are illustrated in various ways in the volume before us. He maintained an intimate intercourse with men of the most opposite opinions, and freely expressed for them the most sincere friendship. He was accustomed to speak, in his strongest language, of the bitterness and alienation which existed amongst Christians.

'"Alas!" said he on another occasion, "for our church!—formerly she was the mother of all sects, now she is sectarian herself; embittered with the same spite and animosity to the sects, which the sects feel towards one another."—"Oh! it is a change," he would mournfully say, "as degrading to our dignity as weakening to our strength."—"We have thrown ourselves down the proud and secure eminence on which we once stood." "We are no longer the rallying point, to which you all ran, from each other's wrathful passions and bitter strife. We are become to you all, the one common object of suspicion or aversion. Instead of love, we get your hatred; and instead of respect, we shall soon have, and deserve, your contempt." p. 134.

'Speaking of friendly intercouse between persons of differing creeds, thus he remarks; "I have always found that when men of sense and virtue mingle in free conversation, the harsh and confused suspicions, which they may have entertained of each other, gradually give way to more just and more candid sentiments. In reality, the example of many great and good men averts every imputation of impropriety from such intercourse; and the information which I have myself gained, by conversing with learned teachers of different sects, will always make me remember with satisfaction, and acknowledge with gratitude, the favor they have done to me, by their unreserved and judicious communications." p. 139.

'"Very few and very simple," said he, on another occasion, "are the truths, which we have any of us a right to pronounce necessary to salvation. It is extremely unsafe to bewilder the judgment, or to inflame the passions of men, upon those abstruse subjects of controversy, about which bigots indeed may dogmatise with fierce and imperious confidence; whilst they, who are scholars without pedantry, and believers without superstition, are content to differ from each other, with sentiments of mutual respect and mutual forbearance."' p. 289.

'"The writer is a lover of peace; and of liberty, too, he is a most ardent lover, because liberty is the best means by which real peace can be obtained and secured. He therefore looks down with scorn upon every species of bigotry, and from every species of persecution he shrinks with horror. He believes that wheresoever imperious and turbulent teachers have usurped an excessive ascendancy over the minds of an ignorant and headstrong multitude, religion will always be disgraced, morals always vitiated, and society always endangered. But the real honor, the real interests, the real and most important cause of the established church he has ever supported, and will support, as he also ever has contended, and will contend, in favor of a liberal, efficient, and progressive toleration."' pp. 329.

While he lived at Norwich he was the friend of Dr John Taylor, and greatly approved and admired his 'Key to the Apostolic Writings.' He considered it—

'As the best introduction to the epistolary writings, and the best account of the whole Christian scheme, that has ever yet been published. As such, he constantly read and consulted it himself; as such, he earnestly recommended it to all who wished to form just and reasonable ideas of Christianity, and to understand properly those views of it, which are held forth in the writings of the apostles.' p. 135.

This work was held in similar estimation, Mr Field remarks, by Archbishop Newcome, Bishop Watson, Paley, and Dr Hey.

Dr Parr's respect for Dr Priestley is well known. 'The man lives not,' he said, 'who has a more sincere veneration for his talents and his virtues than I have.' His celebrated character of that distinguished divine has been often quoted. In the present work we find other evidences of the estimation in which he held him, from which we cite the following.

'When "he [Parr] preached for the charity-schools at Birmingham, he earnestly recommended to the attention of his audience two admirable sermons, written by Dr Priestley, one of which is on *Habitual Devotion*, and the other on *The Duty of not living to ourselves*." * * * "Of the two sermons, now mentioned," said the eloquent preacher, "I confidently affirm, that the wisest man cannot read them without being wiser, nor the best man without being better."' p. 292.

'"I have visited him, as I hope to visit him again, because he is an unaffected, unassuming, and very interesting companion. I will not, in consequence of our different opinions, either impute to him the evil which he does not, or depreciate in him the good which he is allowed to do. I will not debase my understanding, or prostitute my honor, by encouraging the clamors which have been raised against him, in vulgar minds, by certain persons, who would have done well to read before they wrote—to understand, before they dogmatised—to examine before they condemned. I cannot think his religion insincere, because he worships one Deity, in the name of one Saviour; and I know that his virtues, in private life, are acknowledged by his neighbours, admired by his congregation, and regarded almost by the unanimous suffrage of his most powerful and most distinguished antagonists."' pp. 295, 296.

'In the catalogue of Dr Parr's library, is the following note;—"This beautiful edition of Beza's Text was given to me spontaneously and po-

litely, by order of the vestry of the Unitarians of Birmingham, soon after I had written an English inscription for Dr Priestley, whose monument is erected in the Unitarian Chapel. He was an eminently great and truly good man; and Dr Parr's most respected, most injured and calumniated friend. S. P."' p. 297.

Mr Field has the following paragraph respecting Bishop Horsley, which we quote, however, principally for the sake of the remark of Dr Parr with which it closes.

'A bold polemic, like Dr Priestley, fearlessly attacking the main articles of the popular creed, and publicly challenging its advocates to stand forth in its defence, soon found himself assailed, as might have been expected, by a whole host of adversaries. Amongst these came forward, with proud look and menacing air, that celebrated champion of high orthodoxy and high episcopacy, Dr Horsley, who was richly rewarded for his exertions, by being promoted successively to the see of St David's, Rochester, and St Asaph. He was a man endued with great powers of mind, and possessed of vast stores of erudition; of that kind, especially, which is usually denominated recondite. His writings are numerous; some valuable, and all bearing the stamp of his superior genius and learning. But, as a controversialist, he was extremely unfair and illiberal; never hesitating to resort, when argument failed, to disingenuous artifice, or contemptuous reproach. His avowed purpose of vilifying or destroying the honorable fame of his illustrious opponent, in order to diminish the authority of his name, and the influence of his writings, was a project worthy the darkest times of popish ignorance and superstition, when to falsify and deceive, for the honor and the interest of the church, was regarded as virtuous. Never was censure more just, or more deserved, than that which was cast upon him by Dr Parr, in the following passage: "In too many instances such modes of defence have been used by him against this formidable heresiarch, as would hardly be justifiable against the arrogance of a Bolingbroke, the buffoonery of a Mandeville, and the levity of a Voltaire."' pp. 297, 298.

Dr Parr was the friend also of Wakefield, and wrote a letter on receiving the tidings of his death, from which his biographer gives us the following extracts.

'"Sir,—I was yesterday evening honoured with your letter; I read the contents of it with inexpressible anguish; I passed a comfortless night, and this morning I am scarcely able to thank you as I ought to do, for your delicacy in averting the shock, which I must have suffered, if intelligence so unexpected and so distressing had rushed upon me from the newspapers." *** "To the learning of that excellent person, my understanding is indebted for much valuable information; but my heart acknowledges yet higher obligations to his virtuous example. I loved him unfeignedly; and though our opinions on various subjects, both in criticism and theology, were different, that difference never disturbed our quiet, nor relaxed our mutual good-will."—"In diligence, doubtless, he far surpassed any scholar, with whom it is my lot to have been personally acquainted; and though his writings now and then carry with them some marks of extreme irritability, he was adorned, or, I should rather say, he was *distinguished* by *one* excellence, which every wise man will admire, and every good man will wish at least to emulate. THAT excellence was, in truth, a very rare one; for it existed in the complete exemption of his soul from all the secret throbs, all the perfidious machinations, and

all the mischievous meanness of envy."—"For my part, sir, I shall ever think and ever speak of Mr Wakefield, as a very profound scholar, as a most honest man, and as a Christian, who united knowledge with zeal, piety with benevolence, and the simplicity of a child with the fortitude of a martyr."—"Under the deep and solemn impressions which his recent death has made upon my mind, I cannot but derive consolation from that lesson, which has been taught me by one of the wisest among the sons of men. 'The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise, they seem to die, and their departure is taken for misery—but they are in peace.'" pp. 447–449.

Among the notices of other men contained in this volume, there are some things said of Sir William Jones, which deserve our attention. He was the schoolfellow and constant friend of Dr Parr, who at one time intended to write his life, which it is much to be regretted he did not do, as it is made very evident, that Lord Teignmouth has in some respects misrepresented that eminent man. Dr Paley is said by Meadley to have 'often animadverted with some severity on the very "unsatisfactory accounts" which Lord Teignmouth has given of Sir William Jones's political principles and conduct. "He was a great republican," said Dr Paley, "when I knew him;" alluding to a period when the accomplished barrister was distinguishing himself by his writings, and by his exertions to obtain some important reforms in the British Constitution. "The sentiments which he then avowed so decidedly," continued Dr Paley, "he certainly never afterwards disclaimed, and his sentiments on questions of great public importance, ought to have been neither extenuated nor withheld."' Dr Parr concurred in this censure of Teignmouth's work, and extended it to his account of Sir William Jones's religious principles.

'When Lord Teignmouth, whose creed is highly orthodox, laboured to make it appear that Sir William Jones adopted the same creed, he must have strangely misconceived, or wilfully misrepresented, the truth.

'Dr Parr often asserted in the hearing of the present writer, as from his own knowledge, that so far from admitting the popular views of Christianity, Sir William Jones held those which are commonly distinguished by the name of Unitarianism. That assertion is, indeed, proved, as far as negative proof can go, by the passages from his writings, produced by Lord Teignmouth in the "Memoirs." In all these, it is impossible not to remark the total absence of every expression, which might imply the admission of such a theological system, as that attributed to him, by his biographer. Every one of his devotional pieces, and all his observations of a religious kind, proceed upon the principles of what the learned Dr Lardner calls the ancient Nazarean doctrine, or that of the early Jewish Christians. In some degree on the authority of these very passages, and still more, on the decisive authority of Dr Parr, the writer thinks himself warranted in placing Sir William Jones amongst the members of the anti-trinitarian and anti-calvinistic schools of Christian philosophers; and of adding his illustrious name to those of Newton, Locke, and Milton, of Clarke, Tucker, Hartley, and Law.' pp. 356–358.

Some of Dr Parr's friends have taken a similar step for the purpose of concealing from the world an intimation of *his* private opinions. In the catalogue of his library, he had written against Bishop Burgess's 'Divinity of Christ Proved &c,' the following sentences ;—'From the eminently learned and truly pious author. *But he does not convince me.*' In publishing the catalogue and remarks, the sentence in Italics is omitted. It did not answer the purpose of the editors to lead to any suspicion of Dr Parr's Orthodoxy. He never was a zealot for Orthodoxy, most certainly. Many accused him of timidity in explaining his opinions, and his cordial friendship for several distinguished Unitarians led them to doubt their soundness. His approbation of Mr Belsham's recent work on the Epistles might tend to confirm that doubt.

'This work Dr Parr considered as one of the most important theological works, that have appeared for a century past. Of the preliminary dissertation in particular, as a clear, reasonable and judicious exposition of the principles, which ought to guide every translator of the apostolic writings, Dr Parr declared the most unqualified approbation. "With the author of that dissertation," said he on one occasion to the present writer, "I go along smoothly and delightfully from the beginning to the end, with perfect accordance of sentiment, and the most complete satisfaction of mind."' pp. 299, 300.

Belsham's work, as we learn from Mr Field, is thus noticed in the *Bibliotheca Parriana.*

'"This excellent work of Belsham was given to me by the writer. I do not entirely agree with him upon some doctrinal points; but I ought to commend the matter, style, and spirit of the preface; and, in my opinion, the translation does great credit to the diligence, judgment, erudition, and piety of my much respected friend."' p. 300.

Porson's Letters to Travis, in which he established the spuriousness of the text of the Three Witnesses, Parr pronounced to be 'inimitable and invincible.' 'Travis,' said he, 'was a superficial and arrogant declaimer; and his letters to Gibbon brought down upon him the just and heavy displeasure of an assailant equally irresistible for his wit, his reasoning, and his erudition—I mean the immortal Richard Porson.'

Of Dr Parr's Spital Sermon, the preaching of which, or rather its publication and notes, formed an era in his life, the following account is given.

'On this occasion a large concourse of people, amongst whom were many distinguished literary characters, assembled. "Before the service began," says one of his friends, "I went into the vestry, and found Dr Parr seated, with pipes and tobacco placed before him on the table. He evidently felt the importance of the occasion; but felt, at the same time, a confidence in his own powers. When he ascended the pulpit, a profound silence prevailed. Unfortunately, from the great extent of the church, his voice was very imperfectly heard, especially towards the close

of his sentences. The sermon occupied nearly an hour and a quarter in the delivery;* and in allusion to its extreme length, it was remarked by a lady, who had been asked her opinion of it, "Enough there is, and more than enough"—the first words of its first sentence. This bon mot, when reported to the preacher himself, was received by him with much good-humour.' pp. 380–381.

As specimens of Dr Parr's style, we give the following brief passages. The first is his severe, but merited, rebuke of Hurd, by contrast with Warburton, of whom he is speaking.

'"He, my Lord, threw a cloud over no man's brighter prospects of prosperity or honour, by dark and portentous whispers, in the ears of the powerful. He, in private company, blasted no man's good name, by shedding over it the cold and deadly mildews of insinuation. He was too magnanimous to undermine, when his duty and his honour prompted him to overthrow. He was too sincere, to disguise the natural haughtiness and irritability of his temper, under a specious veil of humility and meekness. He never thought it expedient to save appearances, by shaking off the shackles of consistency—to soften the hideous aspect of certain uncourtly opinions, by a calm and progressive apostacy—to expiate the artless and animated effusions of his youth, by the example of an obsequious and temporising old age. He began not, as others have done, with speculative republicanism; nor did he end it, as the same persons are now doing, with practical toryism. He was a churchman without bigotry. He was a politician without duplicity. He was a loyalist without servility."' p. 278.

'In the following passage,' says Mr Field, 'the literary portraitures of the two prelates are placed together, in strong contrast; and it will be owned, that the likeness is sufficiently exact in the case of Warburton, whilst in the case of Hurd it approaches far too much towards caricature.'

'"He blundered against grammar; and you refined against idiom. He, from a defect of taste, contaminated English by Gallicism; and you from excess of affectation, sometimes disgraced what would have risen to ornamental and dignified writing, by a profuse mixture of vulgar or antiquated phraseology. He soared into sublimity, without effort; and you, by effort, sunk into a kind of familiarity, which, without leading to perspicuity, borders upon meanness. He was great, by the energies of nature; and you were little, by the misapplication of art. He, to show his strength, piled up huge and rugged masses of learning; and you to show your skill, split and shivered them into what your brother critic calls ψήγματα καὶ ἀχαιώματα. He sometimes reached the force of Longinus, but with-

* In a note to this passage, Mr Field gives the following quotation;—'Apropos of the Spital Sermon. It gave birth to a tolerably facetious remark of Harvey Combe, albeit unused to the facetious mood. As they were coming out of church, after the delivery of that long discourse, "Well," says Parr to Combe, "how did you like it?" always anxious for well-merited praise, from whatever quarter it proceeded. "Let me have the suffrage of your strong and honest understanding." "Why, Doctor," returned the alderman, "there were four things in your sermon that I did *not* like to hear." "State them," replied Parr, eagerly. "Why, to speak frankly then," said Combe, "they were the quarters of the church clock, which struck four times before you had finished it." The joke was good-humoredly received.—*New Month. Mag.* Nov. 1826.' p. 381.

out his elegance; and you exhibited the intricacies of Aristotle, but without his exactness."' p. 279, 280.

The next passage we shall quote, is from a sermon.

'"When fields are desolated—when ancient and towering cities are torn from their deep foundations—when the tempest pours its undistinguishing and unrelenting rage alike against the throne of the monarch and the cottage of the peasant—when all the harmless enjoyments which solace, and all the useful arts, which adorn social life, are at a stand—when industry droops, without the means of employment—when misery sighs, without the prospect of succour—when indigence pines, without a pittance of daily bread—when the blood of man *formed in God's own image* is deliberately and *systematically* shed by the hand of man—when the orphan weeps in solitude and silence, and the grey hairs of a father are brought down with sorrow to the grave, surely, amidst such scenes there is something upon which a man of reflection may be permitted to pause, when he recollects that, for all these, they who counsel, they who execute—aye, my brethren, and they too who rashly approve, must one day render a strict account before that Being 'unto whom all hearts are open, and all desires, however secret, are known.'"

'That Dr Parr,' says his biographer, 'seriously disapproved the custom of depositing the trophies of war on the altars, or of suspending them within the temples of a holy and benevolent religion, appears from the following passage;—

'"In all probability there was more good sense, more good nature, more tenderness towards man, more humility before God, in a compact between certain heathen nations, by which it was stipulated, that, in order to prevent any arrogant, lasting, and insulting memorial of the contests, which might arise between neighbouring countries, no armour should be hung up, no pillars should be erected, but an inverted spear only should be placed on the spot of victory. So strange, however, and arbitrary are the changes of language, that the word *trophy*, which, in its original signification, specifically and emphatically implied the inoffensive, unassuming, temporary mark of military superiority, should be transferred to those prominent and permanent signs by which the haughtiness of conquerors would perpetuate the fame of their achievements, and expose the weakness of their vanquished foes to the scorn of distant ages."' pp. 398–400.

We trust that the second volume of the work before us, will give us more frequent glimpses of Dr Parr's private and domestic character and manners. They are too scanty in the present volume; but, if we may judge from the passage which we shall next select, he might be made to interest us as a man, no less than as a scholar. One of his pupils had died in his family, and the Rev. Mr Morley gives the following account of a scene at which he was present.

'"Visiting him at Hatton, in obedience to a summons which I received," says Mr Morley, "I found him in the greatest distress. Such, indeed, was the bitterness of his grief, that you would have thought a darling child of his own had died. The day was spent most sorrowfully; and the next morning, after a messenger had been sent to convey the melancholy tidings to the unexpecting parents, the doctor went in search of comfort to his friend and neighbour Lord Dormer. Returning home in the evening, and entering the library, where Mrs Parr, her two daughters, and myself,

were sitting, he sat down, without speaking, by the fire, and sobbed like an infant. His attention was, however, soon called to the preparations necessary for the funeral, in the midst of which, the wonted vigor of his mind returned; and he dictated to me one of the most pathetic and impressive funeral orations, that, perhaps, have ever been penned in any language. What follows will never be effaced from my memory. We were smoking our pipes the evening before the interment, when it was told to the doctor that the coffin was about to be screwed down. He sat quietly a few moments, and then hurried me along with him to the chamber, where the deceased lay. There, after taking a last view of the corpse, he ordered the whole house to be assembled; and falling on his knees, while his grief seemed as if it would, every moment, stop his utterance, he burst forth into an extempore prayer, so piously humble, so fervently devout, so consummately eloquent, that it drew tears from all present."' pp. 368, 369.

We have attempted but a hasty and superficial notice of the present volume. We may perhaps give a connected view of the life, character, and writings of Dr Parr, on the completion of the work.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

19. The Glory of the Latter House. A Sermon, on the Dedication of the First Presbyterian Church in the City of Boston, delivered January 31, 1828. By James Sabine, Pastor. 8vo. pp. 20.

THIS sermon deserves notice both because of the singular fortunes of its author, and the ingenious felicity with which its text is adapted to the occasion. The author is a subject of interest because of the strange and unexplained treatment which he and his church have received from the hands of the reigning sect, by whom they have been excluded from one house of worship, and driven to erect another on the marshes at the very confines of the city. It was at the dedication of the 'latter' house, that this sermon was preached; and the words of the text contain the assertion, very significantly applied by the preacher, 'The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts; and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lordof Hosts.' The application of these words may be gathered from the following passages of the sermon.

'It is a fact too well known, that the church and society now present, are assembled to day, to dedicate the *second House of Worship* built expressly for their sacred use, in this city. I shall do but little more, at this stage of our address, than refer to the sad story, by saying, that in the former house we had to contend with a great deal of wickedness, and were extreme sufferers in the contest. In this house we hope to find an asylum from our spiritual adversaries, and peace in the enjoyment of divine ordinances—these things realized, and the glory of this latter house will be greater than of the former, and the possession of peace will be, to us, a gift of high value, for which the God of peace will be entitled to our most unfeigned gratitude, and most exalted praise. pp. 3, 4.

'The house we have builded, and which we are come together to consecrate, is the *second* built for the same congregation,—a second house, not because the first was too strait, and a larger one needed—not because the former was old or worn out or destroyed by devouring elements—not because it was willingly relinquished and righteously given up. No. But because the congregation were chiefly poor or in humble life, and unable to defend themselves from the oppressions and violent dealings of their rich brethren, and the more to be dreaded wordly policy of sister churches. But these circumstances will be noticed in a way more becoming the subject, and the solemnity of the occasion, by giving them a place severally under separate articles. pp. 9, 10.

'1. The moral character of this establishment which we dedicate to day, will excel that of the former, in that this house has been built and the society organized in perfect agreement with the law of the State, as expressed in the Statute Books. p. 10.

'2. The character of this church will abundantly

exceed all that was ever attained by the former, if we continue to assert and maintain that principle of Christian Liberty, upon which we have ventured off, in the face of surrounding ecclesiastical tyrannies. The former house, with much that belonged to its moral concerns, had its beginning in a most disgraceful dependance; its founders and chief supporters were men who loved this present world. In the lust of power,—in the pride of office,—in the hope of gain, their cupidity was insatiable. pp. 12, 13.

'This house was not built for the love any of its proprietors have to office, or honour, or emolument, or party. No! it was erected by a concentration of charities, for a poor people, who much needed such an asylum. p. 12.

'3. Should the affairs of this church be conducted upon principles of strict honour, with a due regard to the feelings and just expectations of all parties in the compact, then the character of this house will very much exceed that of the former house. p. 13.

'4. Finally. If the people now brought to this house, should harmoniously settle down into a state of spiritual quiet, and persevere in the exercise of that temper which maketh for peace; then not only will the character of this establishment exceed that of the former, but the promise made in the text to Israel will be fulfilled very happily in our experience. 'And here will I give you peace, saith the Lord of Hosts.' p. 16.

'The subject thus introduced, and thus applied, cannot fail to make one impression, at least, upon the minds of all in this assembly who are at all acquainted with the history and experience of this society. The impression is this, That here is a stand taken for Christian Liberty—the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us Free. Yes, brethren, this is the infallible and indelible impression. This house was not erected as a standard of orthodoxy, nor for the dissemination of heresy, nor for party, nor for novelty, nor for any mere experiment whatever; not because another church was wanted, but purely for Liberty—Liberty of conscience, that liberty of which a powerful party is endeavouring to plunder us, and of which all that are feeble in the church *will be* ravished unless they rally around the standard Christ has lifted up in Zion.' pp. 16, 17.

We do not profess any great sympathy for the doctrine or government of the Presbyterian Church, but we desire to honor every stand taken for christian rights and liberty, and wish it God speed.

---

20. The Cypress Wreath, or Mourner's Friend; a Selection of Pieces adapted to the Consolation of the Afflicted. Greenfield, Mass. Phelps & Clark. 1828. pp. 108.

THE pieces in this volume are, almost without exception, poetical, and are gathered from approved authors at home and abroad. The selection appears to us to have been very happily made, combining the two requisites of beautiful poetry and religious consolation. The Editor, who, as we learn from the preface, is the minister of the Episcopal Church in Greenfield, has done a kindness to the afflicted for which many will heartily thank him. Those who are desirous of putting into the hands of mourners the means of soothing their feelings, and 'beguiling some lonely moments of their sadness,' will find this a valuable addition to their list of books adapted to this purpose. We could make serious exception to a few sentiments and expressions; but they are not of sufficient consequence to impair the general merit of the book.

---

21. The Prospects of Christianity. A Sermon, delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. Warren Burton, as Minister of the Third Congregational Society in Cambridge; March 5, 1828. By F. W. P. Greenwood. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn, 1828. 12mo. pp. 22.

THE text of this discourse is Rev. xi. 15; 'And there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.' As exhibiting proof of the gradual accomplishment of this assurance, a sketch is attempted of the external, and of the internal or domestic progress of Christianity. After a few remarks illustrative of the fact, 'that the *Christian* portion is the *civilized* portion of the globe,' the preacher has the following remarks, which we make no apology for presenting to our readers, though they must necessarily occupy considerable space.

'Such is the outline of the principal possessions of Christianity; and we ought to be encouraged, when we consider that Christianity embraces a large proportion of the numerical, and by far the largest proportion of the moral power of humanity. What then are the probabilities that these boundaries will be enlarged? This is the next inquiry and I am disposed to return a favorable answer to it; though it must be in a great measure hypothetical, as it must be founded on reasoning from apparent causes to probable effects. I argue the continued progress of Christianity, in the first place, from the active spirit which is abroad among Christians to extend the advantages of their religion in every possible, and I believe I may add, impossible way.

'It would be a great mistake, however, to speak of christian missions as anything new. What was it that planted the gospel in the northern portions of Europe, in France, Germany, and more especially in England, where the gospel has seen its brightest ornaments, and effected its most glorious objects, what was it, I ask, but missions from Rome? From the earliest ages, the church, which word I use in its most comprehensive sense, has been diligent in enlarging its dominions; sometimes peaceably, sometimes forcibly, sometimes wisely, and sometimes weakly, sometimes by fair means, and sometimes by foul; in short, by methods tempered and characterized by the opinions and condition of the age, and the views,

motives, and genius of the various actors in the work. Many of these enterprises perished abortively; of many others we see the fruits. The spirit which produced them has been the spirit of Christianity, in a greater or less degree, and under one aspect or another, ever since its birth. It is not, then, because this spirit is new and young, but because, being old, it is fresh and untired, and seems within late years to have acquired increased vigor, that I infer from it the further advancement of our religion.

'Of all the manifestations of this zeal for the foreign dissemination of the gospel, it would be impossible to speak with equal favor; nor are the means which it employs to be regarded with undiscriminating approbation. Appeals have been made to christian compassion and charity, which were outrages on common sense, and serious accusations of the character of God. No man, who has preserved one spark of reason unsuffocated by the prejudices of a system, can believe, what has been so frequently told him from the press and the pulpit, that while he is hesitating to furnish his contributions to missions, thousands and tens of thousands of his fellow beings are dropping into the yawning pit of everlasting perdition. It is too absurd, presumptuous, horrible. But such representations have had their effect. They have had, indeed, two opposite effects. While they have by their very violence produced their intended impression on some minds, they have so offended others, as to estrange them wholly from the important cause in view.

'It has been thought too, that missionary stations have been selected, and immense means hazarded in defiance of all human probability, and all just expectations of success; and this conviction has deterred many from cooperating in the work. However well grounded these charges may be, I am persuaded that they have unfortunately had an undue weight when they have turned the attention of men from the great end of the exertions which are making, the diffusion of christian knowledge, habits, and happiness. I do think, that in view of this end, all defective, or apparently defective means, not absolutely immoral, should be overlooked, or regarded with charitable indulgence, even though we may not see fit to adopt them. Though we cannot approve, we need not revile. There has been too much said, and it has been said too bitterly, as was hinted before, concerning these means; they have been brought forward too prominently on both sides, they have been a veil of obscurity before the all-important end, and a wall of partition between those who should have met, and who, one of these days, will meet. If I were requested to contribute my aid toward a mission to Turkey, or to China, I should answer, No; whatever I can spare, must be devoted to what I consider more feasible purposes. I see no probability of your success. You may, it is true, convert thousands, you may do wonders; but if you do, I am absolved from blame, for while I remain in the world I must govern myself by a consideration of probabilities. I have no other rule; and by that rule I judge your project to be absolutely chimerical. Nevertheless, if you deem it your duty to go, and if others deem it their duty to send you, go, and I shall say, that, though not wisely, you do well; and when you have died, as many others have, in a far off land, in the midst of strangers and heathen, and without a single convert, or the hope of a convert, to cheer your departing soul, I shall sorrow for you with a true sorrow, and believe that though in the sight of men you have entirely failed of success, you will be abundantly rewarded by that Almighty Being,

"To whose all-pondering mind, a noble aim,
Faithfully kept, is as a noble deed;
In whose pure sight all virtue doth succeed."

'But all missionary projects are not of the same character. In several of them, circumstances have been prudently consulted, and, as in the case of the Sandwich Islands, a hopeful state of progress has been the reward. It is one of the consequences, indeed, of the spirit of which I have been speaking, that it is so highly excited, and so constantly on the alert, that whenever opportunities are presented, they are seized; the mere shadow of an opportunity is caught at; and it is only reasonable to suppose that some openings must occur favorable to the introduction of christian doctrine. Great means may be, to all appearance, thrown away; money, and more precious life may be sacrificed; unnumbered errors may be committed, in the career of experiment; but the diffusion of christian faith and practice, which it is but bare justice to all sects to say, invariably go together, must in some degree be the issue; and God only knows whether the final good does not overbalance the losses which were suffered, and the mistakes which were committed in bringing it about. It is not a question, at any rate, which I shall undertake to decide.

'There are two further considerations which present themselves to me, as reasons for believing that our religion is making external advances in the world. One is, that civilisation is pressing hard on the confines of barbarism. The desire of gain, the energies of commerce, the spirit of discovery, the spirit of adventure, and the feelings of humanity, are, from time to time, wresting fair and broad lands from barbaric dominion; and as yet there have been no reprisals. Civilisation is in its nature the superior power; it is in its nature a progressive power; and as Christianity is its natural ally, they are advancing together. All the acquisitions and settlements of new territory are making, and have been for a long time made, by the natives of christian countries, who have taken their religion with them; not always, indeed, as we could wish, for the treasure has often been contained emphatically in earthern vessels; but for future good, as it is the character of our religion to purify itself from the corruptions of sordid admixtion or contact. In proof of the above position, I have only to refer to the vast British possessions in India, where Christianity, aided by the influences of civilisation, and supported by the countenance of physical power and authority, must at last become predominant over the artificial distinctions of caste and in spite of the resistance of long rooted superstition; and, for my second example, to the colony in New Holland, which, though strangely planted at first, is already considered as an important appendage of the British empire, and will grow up at last into an independent and powerful nation.

'I might also speak of the promises which are held out by the American and European colonies on the coast of Africa; but I must pass to the other general consideration, which is, that as reason, mental cultivation, benevolence, and unrestrained national intercourse achieve their triumphs, and effect their apparently destined objects, Christianity must gradually approach toward supreme dominion. Under one modification or another, it must accompany the progress of the human intellect, and the enlargement of the human affections. There is no other religion which can bear the search of light, or can breathe the atmosphere of high moral feeling. There is a strict affinity between it and all that is good in our nature and great in our destiny; and though

oceans and ages intervene, they will find each other out at last. If the present multitudes of unenlightened people are ever to improve materially, they must forsake religions which contain little to exalt and much to debase our nature, and adopt a religion which will approve itself to their cultivated reason, which will meet them in their progression, and incite them to new efforts and still higher accomplishments. And what other religion is there which can do this, but the religion of Christ? Whether, therefore, Christianity is the primary instrument of the supposed improvement of heathen nations, or whether they are to improve themselves, or be improved, without it, till they arrive at that point where they will be obliged to adopt a pure and divine religion to supply the rising demands of mind and soul, it will be the faith of an elevated moral condition of the world. Thus its character is, of itself, an augury of its advancement.' pp. 9–14.

Whether the falsities and absurdities which have been connected with Christianity and exhibited in heathen countries as essential parts of the gospel, have created a prejudice against our religion, which it will take more time to remove than must elapse before the christian world itself shall be truly evangelized, is a question which Mr Greenwood has not touched. Till it is decided, however, it must remain a doubt whether the accidental good resulting from past missionary efforts, is sufficient to balance the unquestionable evil which has arisen in the way we have just mentioned. We are not prepared to say that it is not sufficient; but the evil is unquestionably a great one, and in our view hardly to be estimated. Had the preacher qualified his remarks a little with reference to this fact, we should not only have had nothing to object to them, but have read them with entire satisfaction. Of the second topic of his discourse, the internal progress of Christianity, we have left ourselves no room to speak. The views he presents are full of encouragement, and the whole sermon is of that character which has long made it a matter of course with us to recommend whatever comes from his pen.

---

22. Deathbed Scenes and Pastoral Conversations. By the late John Warton, D. D. Edited by his Sons. From the English Edition. Philadelphia. Carey, Lea, and Carey. 2 volumes in one. 8vo.

This is a posthumous work, purporting to record conversations which actually took place between a minister and his parishioners, and designed to serve in some degree, 'as a manual for the information and direction of a minister in his daily intercourse with sick persons, and other members of his flock.' It embraces a great variety of religious topics, both doctrinal and practical. It is upon an excellent plan, which offers opportunity to treat many subjects in a familiar way and by familiar illustrations, and might be imitated to great advantage for the purpose of instruction upon many subjects of religious knowledge and duty. The tract of the Unitarian Association, 'On some Corruptions of Scripture,' is an example of this manner; and every minister might furnish instances of the same from his own experience. The work before us is written in behalf of the English Episcopal Church, whose authority and doctrines it earnestly advocates; on one page maintaining them against the Evangelical party, and on another zealously enlisting in defence of the Athanasian creed. There is a great deal of talent in the book, and the practical portions may be generally read with edification.

---

23. On the Nature and Remedy of Sin. A Sermon, preached at the Dedication of a new Meetinghouse in Walpole, N. H. Feb. 20th, 1828. By Rev. T. R. Sullivan. Keene, N. H. 8vo. pp. 24.

Mr Sullivan has chosen an important and difficult subject, to the handling of which, however, he has shown himself equal. The advocates of the doctrine of native depravity have changed their ground in our time, and are content to say but little of its derivation from Adam. The depravity of man's nature, is implied, we are told, in his destitution of religion. He has 'nothing in his constitution of which religion is the result without a special Divine interposition; nothing in his constitution by which he will become religious, as by the cultivation of his natural faculties he becomes learned, refined, or moral.' This doctrine is met in the sermon before us by an appeal to experience and observation, by which alone, in the silence of scripture, the question can be determined, and which are clearly, to our minds, in favor of a contrary position. Those interested in such discussions will find much light thrown upon the subject, which Mr Sullivan has presented in various points of view, in all of which he has treated it with much clearness and ability. The remedies of sin are stated to be two;—the mediation of Christ, and the influences of the spirit of God. The author's opinions on either of

these subjects are not peculiar to himself, though his statement of them is, we think, uncommonly simple, clear, and satisfactory. We doubt not that views much resembling those he gives, are destined to become the prevalent faith of the church, and we trust that this discourse will have its share of influence in producing this result.

---

24. An Apology for the Bible, in a Series of Letters, addressed to Thomas Paine, Author of a Book entitled 'The Age of Reason, Part the Second, being an Investigation of True and Fabulous Theology.' By R. Watson, D. D. F. R. S. Lord Bishop of Landaff, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge. Hilliard & Brown. 1828. 18mo. pp. 174.

THE character of this work is so well established, that any remarks of ours upon it are unnecessary. It is universally acknowledged as one of the best antidotes for the infidel writings of Paine, of which we are possessed. Those writings have of late been printed in large and cheap editions, and industriously circulated throughout the country. Upon the well informed they can make no impression whatever. But with the ignorant and those who have not been accustomed to reflection, or who have heard little or nothing of the Christian or Jewish evidences, the case, we fear, is very different. To such persons, some work like this before us, is highly important, and the publishers, in presenting it in a form and at a price which make it accessible to the most limited means, and enable the charitably disposed to distribute it as a tract, are entitled to the thanks of the christian community.

---

25. An Abstract of the Bible History, with a Scheme of Scripture Chronology and Questions for Examination. First American from the Seventh English Edition, with Alterations and Additions. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 18mo. pp. 216.

THE English work of which this is little more than a reprint, was prepared by a gentleman of high standing among the Unitarians of England, Mr William Turner, Lecturer to the Literary and Philosophical Society, Newcastle upon Tyne. It was originally a small manual for a Sunday School. New editions were repeatedly called for, and as often as it passed through the press, it received improvements and additions till it attained its present size. We have carefully compared the English copy with the one now before us, which bears evident marks of the American editor's labors, and is decidedly an improvement upon its transatlantic prototype. We state these things to show that the work, in its present form, has been the result of unwearied care, and we believe it may be depended upon as an accurate representation of the scripture story. The language is simple, the narration plain, perspicuous, and engaging; the moral lessons it occasionally inculcates, admirable, and, delivered as they are, in connexion with striking incidents, well adapted to seize the attention and make lasting impressions upon the minds of the young. On the whole, we know not a work on the subject, which we should more unhesitatingly recommend. We think it will be found an invaluable aid in the religious instruction of families and schools; especially as no Christians of any sect, we suppose, can find in it anything objectionable on the score of doctrine, except indeed it be those who deem all religious works worthless, which recognise none but the undisputed principles of Christianity, the work before us avoiding doctrinal statements and discussions, as not at all coming within the compass of its design. Another thing much in favor of this book is its extreme cheapness, which, in books for the young especially, is a circumstance by no means undeserving attention.

---

26. The Christian Teacher's Manual; designed for Families and Sunday Schools. Vol. 1. No. 1. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 18mo. pp. 72.

THE first number of this little work, which is designed to be issued monthly, is just published.

The object of the publication is, to furnish parents and Sunday School teachers with such materials and views to aid them in their religious instructions, as they may not be able so easily to obtain in any other way; to bring into a small compass what may be advantageously employed in introducing to the minds of children a knowledge of God and his government, and in presenting and enabling them to acquire correct views in regard to religious and moral opinions and conduct. The talents which have

heretofore been evinced by the editor of this work, and the aid which we understand is promised by many who feel a deep interest in the design, and who will be able contributors to its pages, lead us to believe that it will be highly useful in promoting its objects. A work of this kind has long been wanted.

The first number contains, besides the preface, a brief account of the Origin of Sunday Schools, a view of What should be taught in Sunday Schools, and, What are the requisites in a Sunday School Teacher. With the hope of aiding those who are about forming Sunday Schools, an account is given of the management of the Franklin School, one of the most successful establishments of the kind in Boston. With this is connected one of the general lessons, as given by the Superintendent, in which we find a short and interesting lesson in Natural Theology, adapted to the minds of quite young children, accompanied by a neat lithographic print by way of illustration. Remarks on the subject of Figurative Representations of God, from Lady Fenn's treatise on the First Principles of Religion; Conversation of Jesus with the Jews on the Observances of Fasting and Prayer; James and his Sister, and the Best Way to be Happy, two very interesting little stories narrated with much natural truth and full of useful instruction, make up the rest of the prose part of this number; to which is added a Hymn of Montgomery's, What is Prayer; Hymn for a Child, and Hymn to Spring.

The general subjects to be embraced in the work, we are told in the preface, will be the following:—

'Methods of addressing the minds of children.
'Hints to teachers.
'Explanations of Scripture, with geographical and historical illustrations.
'Religious instruction from natural objects, and histories taken from real life.
'Stories and hymns adapted to children.
'Accounts of Sunday schools.

We observe that parents and teachers are requested to propose subjects to be discussed in the pages of the Manual, and in this way we hope that many difficulties of inexperienced teachers will be removed, and the danger of doing harm, by the powerful engine of Sunday schools, diminished.

---

27. 'A Discourse, delivered in Charleston, (S. C.) on the 21st of Nov. 1827, before the Reformed Society of Israelites, for Promoting the True Principles of Judaism according to its Purity and Spirit, on their Third Anniversary. By Isaac N. Cardozo, a Member. Charleston. James S. Burgess. 1827. 8vo. pp. 18.

We have before had occasion to speak of the 'Reformed Society of Israelites,' as one among the innumerable evidences around us of the progress of general improvement. To refresh our readers' recollections, we quote a few lines from our author, who speaks of his association as

'A society that was instituted mainly for effecting the observance of order and decorum in Hebrew worship; for adapting it to the feelings and propensities of the enlightened Israelite of the present day; and for endeavouring to bring about by argument and petition, what neither necessity nor persuasion could before accomplish.' pp. 4, 5.

We are pleased to see that its members are persevering and untiring in their laudable efforts, and have read their anniversary discourses with a feeling of much respect for their authors. We would gladly quote from the remarks before us on the common obstacles to all reforms in religion, which are for the most part judicious and striking. It seems that these reformers have met with the common fate of all who dare to assail time-hallowed abuses, and we could almost believe that the following were sentences of a Unitarian Christian.

'The members of this society have been accused of striking at some of the fundamental truths of their religion. We are willing to ascribe such imputations to a misunderstanding of our creed. Many have adopted false and erroneous impressions against us without inquiry or reflection. Prepossessions have been so hasty, and prejudice so implacable, that no effort of reason or of justice has been allowed to bear sway for a moment. But, regardless of the hostility we meet with, we shall always look with a single eye to the prosperity of our faith, and always consider the reforms we have undertaken as the surest means to advance and perpetuate its blessings.' pp. 14, 15.

There is much more in the same excellent spirit.

---

28. Moral Lessons in Verse, compiled by the Editor of the 'Juvenile Miscellany.' Cambridge. Hilliard & Brown. 1828. 18mo. pp. 66.

Teachers of Sunday Schools, and others engaged in the instruction of children, will find in this little volume a valuable aid in giving to the young mind religious impressions and associations, with nothing to injure, but on the contrary with much to aid in the formation of a correct taste, the pieces being selected with a scrupulous regard to propriety of sentiment and language.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarianism at Geneva.—The Christian Spectator, in its second number for this year, affords its aid in giving publicity to the fact that at Geneva, the metropolis of the Reformation, a better theology has supplanted that of Calvin. So far we are gratified. That fact is important, and useful to be known in quarters to which the Spectator has access. With respect to some occurrences connected with it, of which the paper in question professes to give an account, a person of small perspicacity will perceive that they will have one or another aspect, according as they are related in one or another way. For a way of relating them, differing from that of the Spectator, as well as for various facts and considerations belonging to the case, but omitted in that work, we refer any who are curious on the subject to p. 37 of our fourth volume, and to Vol. III. p. 214 of the Christian Disciple, New Series.

There are some matters, however, in the Spectator's account, which deserve a brief notice.

'One question and answer in the new catechism,' says the writer, 'we will quote.' "What results from what we have said of the person of Jesus Christ?" Answer;—"*That we ought to be penetrated with respect for him.*"

The new catechism of Geneva, which by the way is, according to our recollection of the date, forty, according to this writer's, fifty years old, is a very common book in this country. Whoever will be at the pains of turning to it, may see that the actual answer here referred to is; 'His character ought to inspire us with respect, submission, confidence, and love.' The writer in the Spectator is not chargeable with the falsehood. It was first vented in a pamphlet of a M. Grénus of Geneva, acknowledged by his cochampions to be a person without principle. From him, if our memoranda are correct, it was copied, first, into the Evangelical Magazine, and then into the fifteenth volume of the Panoplist. Thence perhaps, and perhaps through some other channel, it found its way into the Spectator's columns.

'In 1818,' it is further said, 'M. Chenevière was called to be professor of theology; than whom there was no man in the ranks of the Socinian pastors who less adorned his profession with a conversation apparently holy.'

We shall not attend to any quibble founded on the comparison of the gentleman named, with 'other Socinian pastors.' The meaning, as it will be taken, and was meant to be taken, is, that he does not 'adorn his profession with a conversation apparently holy.' M. Chenevière is a stranger to the American public. He dwells some four thousand miles distant from those to whom he is thus represented. He is without protection against such an assault, if any one chooses to make it. The author of this charge, perhaps, did not suppose that it would fall into the hands of any who would know its character. We do not say that a foreigner is to be thus shielded from animadversion upon his public acts. These he has placed before the world; and they must speak, as they are intended to speak, for themselves. But by a '*holy conversation*,' we suppose was meant,—we know will be understood to be meant,—a religious private life; and in the name of all that is manly and merciful, we pray that such attacks upon the defenceless, so safe to make from their vagueness, and so injurious, if credited, may be forborne. In this case, we can only say, as we do upon a responsible authority, that M. Chenevière enjoys the most respectful and affectionate estimation in the place of his residence, as a citizen, professor, and pastor; and that very numerous excellent Christians would regard such a representation of him, as the sentence which we have quoted will convey, as a representation utterly unjust.

'The city,' to quote the Spectator again, 'became the scene of a public riot to disturb their private meetings, in which "Down with Jesus Christ,"—"Down with the Moravians," was the watchword.'

Whatever riotous conduct any of the populace may have been guilty of, in a time of high excitement, and under a mistaken sense of provocation, we have no doubt the magistrates, pastors, and all people of standing at Geneva, would have been prompt and unanimous to discountenance and condemn. A statement like that given above, made by Dr J. Pye Smith, led Mr Bakewell, the traveller,

to institute an inquiry. The following representation makes the '*public riot*,' of which the '*city became the scene*,' appear in other dimensions.

'With respect to the mob and outcry at Geneva, mentioned by Dr Smith, never having heard of it when I was there, I wrote to a friend to know how far the account of Dr S. was correct. He informs me, that when Messrs Guers and Empaytaz first formed a congregation, chiefly of young men and women, they assembled in the evening in an obscure part of the town. The novelty of the thing drew together at first a number of persons, principally children, who brought lanterns, and cried, "Down with the Môniers," but the magistrates afterwards sent gens-d'armes to preserve the peace and to protect the new sect. With respect to the cry of "Down with Jesus Christ," from the strictest inquiries it does not appear that it was ever uttered. My friend says, "*Ce cri n' est en notre pays dans la bouche et le cœur de personne.*"'

We are not sure that it was a design, but we are persuaded that it will be an effect of the piece in the Spectator, to create the impression that Unitarians are chargeable with the persecutions in the Canton de Vaud, to which that paper refers, and of which some further account may be found in the Edinburgh Review, xlii. 390. 'The fact is,' to repeat what we have before had occasion to state, 'that on the point of the trinity, at least, the church and the government of the *Pays de Vaud* are decidedly and bigotedly Orthodox, and have been heretofore not a little busy in exciting odium on this account against Geneva. "We may number," Professor Chenevière says, "among the antagonists of the Genevan clergy, the pastors of Lausanne, who broke off all connexion with them. At their head was Dean Curtat, who took every opportunity of speaking and writing against the Genevans, with all his wonted violence. He laughed at the attacks on his neighbours, which he beheld from the height of his Orthodoxy as from an impregnable fort; he was ill able to conceal his joy, when he saw them insulted, nor did he show much repugnance to insulting them himself. This man, otherwise intelligent, well informed, and full of zeal, is violently prejudiced against Geneva; he would speak of that city in the spirit of the words formerly used, 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"' Dr Smith himself has occasion to speak of this dean and his associates as 'holding the Deity of Christ,' and to furnish his caveat, that '*truth* is despoiled of its excellency, if it be held in unrighteousness, if it be degraded to be the badge of a party, if it be maintained in the spirit of rivalship and hostility.' He adds truly, that 'the Council of State of Geneva appears in a very honorable contrast with that of Lausanne.' The case, no doubt, is bad enough in the Canton de Vaud. But it is for the two Trinitarian parties to settle the dispute between them. No one else has any concern with it.

Unitarianism in Philadelphia.—For the following history of the Unitarian church in Philadelphia, we are indebted to a correspondent of that city. We should be happy to receive similar accounts from other places. They make permanent records of interesting matters, which, if left to themselves, will fast fade from recollection, and may hereafter be found of great importance to the religious and ecclesiastical history of our country.

'Dr Priestley arrived in this country in 1794. In the winter of 1795–96 he delivered a course of lectures in Philadelphia on the Evidences of the Christian Revelation. His audiences were large and respectable, and among his regular hearers were many members of Congress, then sitting in this city. These circumstances drew together a small number of persons, professed Unitarians, and mostly emigrants from Great Britain; "wandering sheep," to use the words of one of them, "without fold or shepherd." This little company held meetings with a view to establish a Unitarian church in Philadelphia. Dr Priestley was present at some of them, and showed an interest in the object for which they were called. It was at first proposed to procure a suitable minister. The prospect of his gathering a congregation was considered a fair one. An invitation was given to Mr Toulmin, late Judge Toulmin of the Mississippi Territory, then recently arrived in this country, and son of Dr Joshua Toulmin, of Taunton, in England. The invitation was declined. The purpose of obtaining a minister was then relinquished, and upon the recommendation of Dr Priestley, it was determined that a convenient room should be provided, and that the persons interested should form themselves into an association for the purpose of worshipping

God according to the dictates of their consciences. It was agreed that printed sermons and prayers should be used, and that the office of reader should be filled by each member in rotation. Accordingly, on the 12th of June, 1796, fourteen persons assembled in a room of the University of Pennsylvania, for the first time, for the purposes of social worship upon liberal views. This number was shortly after increased to twentyone. Thus was a Unitarian society commenced in Philadelphia.

'It is with great pride and pleasure that we find grounds for connecting the name of Priestley with one of the earliest efforts made in this country in behalf of Unitarian Christianity. We dare not now indulge ourselves in speaking of this venerated man in the language which our feelings dictate. It would lead us far away from our present purpose. Apart from his vast acquirements and the excellent uses to which he put them, he is associated in our minds with a fearless love of truth, a genuine piety, a most winning artlessness, and a moral enthusiasm, which, like that of Howard, and all the great benefactors of our race, was visible only in the activity to which it prompted, and the abundant good which it accomplished. To the feeling thus expressed towards this true martyr, but few bosoms will respond. But the time is coming, we trust, when the name that has been, and is still loaded with obloquy, shall be high and bright on the list of those who have illustrated the independent and disinterested spirit of Christianity. In the meanwhile we would pay our feeble tribute to the memory of Dr Priestley. And if by connecting ourselves with him we incur any shame, we will bear it cheerfully for his sake, and for the sake of the truth which he loved.

'The Unitarian society of which some account has now been given, continued to meet every Lord's day until the year 1800. In the early part of 1797 Dr Priestley, on a visit to the city from Northumberland, where he had fixed his residence, delivered an address to this humble flock and enrolled himself among its members. In August, 1800, its meetings were discontinued, some of the association having died, and others being scattered. In 1807 they were resumed, and William Christie, the author of a valuable work on the Divine Unity, was invited to conduct the stated religious services. This invitation was accepted, and the Universalists' Church, in Lombard Street, where Dr Priestley had delivered his lectures eleven years before, was obtained for the use of the society. After a few months, this place was given up, and a private room was procured, from which, however, the society was soon compelled to withdraw, their doctrines having excited alarm. Thus rudely driven forth, this small band found refuge in a room in Church Alley, where they remained without molestation, until a place of worship was erected in 1813. The connexion between Mr Christie and the society lasting only a few months, the services were conducted by Ralph Eddowes, James Taylor, and John Vaughan. It was proposed to have evening lectures, and to render them applicable to the circumstances of the society and to the relation in which it stood to the rest of the community; and the first two gentlemen consented to prepare original discourses. This created a new interest and the attendance became regular and was gradually increased. We have reason to believe that the religious services at this period were attended with pleasure and edification. The sacred music was particularly excellent, and the audience was brought together by no habits of listless conformity, but by a real interest in the great topics of religion.

'In 1811, the project of building a church was started, and, after some difficulties, by great efforts and by liberal contributions from their fellow citizens, the society was enabled to accomplish this object. The first stone was laid March 24, 1812, and the house dedicated February 14, 1813. Mr Eddowes preached the dedicatory discourse from the very appropriate words, 'The Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know; if it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord, (save us not this day) that we have built us an altar, &c.' Joshua, xxii. 22.

'In 1815, Mr Vaughan resigned the ministerial office, which he had held in association with Messrs Eddowes and Taylor. Upon this occasion resolutions of thanks were passed, from which we cannot help quoting. Those who know this gentleman, and the sphere of his acquaintance is not limited, will join most cordially in the expressions of respect which they breathe. The language of the society is, "that, impressed by a sense of benefits received, they cannot refrain from expressing those sentiments of esteem which they feel, and those ardent wishes which they cherish, both individu-

ally and collectively, for the welfare of him who has conferred them; sincerely hoping that he may long live, surrounded by his friends, to enjoy that still more solid reward which never fails to crown virtuous and well meant endeavours—the approbation of God and his conscience."

'In 1820, Mr Eddowes gave notice of his intention to discontinue his public services in a few months. His increasing age and infirmities led him to take a step, which excited "the unfeigned regret of the society." "Much," they say, "as we lament the loss which we shall sustain, the reasons assigned by Mr Eddowes for discontinuing his labors among us, particularly as regards the state of his health, render it our duty to acquiesce in the event." "We entertain," they add, "a high sense of the very able manner in which Mr Eddowes has conducted the public services, and the truly christian example by which he has practically illustrated the great duties of our holy religion, and we feel the weight of a large debt of gratitude for his disinterested and gratuitous ministrations among us during a period of nearly thirteen years." With these sentiments they offer him "their most respectful and sincere thanks, accompanied by their warmest wishes for his present welfare and future happiness."

'From the time that Mr Eddowes retired, Mr Taylor conducted the public services until 1823. To estimate the labors of these two gentlemen, it is to be recollected that they had almost wholly ceased to read printed sermons. Devoting themselves to original compositions for the pulpit, they felt the importance of theological knowledge, and a great portion of their time was given to study, the fruits of which were manifest to the society.

'In 1823, Mr Taylor followed the example of Messrs Vaughan and Eddowes, offering however to perform any of the ministerial duties that might be requisite, the ordinary services of the Lord's day excepted. This offer was thankfully accepted by the society, while they could not suffer him "to resign the situation of officiating minister, which he had so long and so ably filled, without tendering him their grateful acknowledgments for the benefits thus conferred." With sentiments of gratitude, they mingle ardent wishes for his future welfare. Their resolutions upon the occasion of his resignation breathe the respect, which the high character of this gentleman for christian probity and untiring zeal in the cause of truth, is fitted to inspire.

'In January 1825, W. H. Furness was ordained to the pastoral care of the "First Congregational Society of Unitarian Christians in Philadelphia," the title under which the charter of incorporation runs.

'Towards the close of 1827, the society, being in a flourishing condition, resolved upon the erection of a new church, the old one not affording sufficient accommodations. In accordance with this resolution the necessary arrangements were made, and the corner stone of the new building was laid on the 25th of March last.

'It is worthy of mention, that it is a custom, universal, we believe, in Philadelphia, when a church is to be erected, to appeal to the generosity of the community at large, without respect to religious names. And it is but justice to add that the community is never backward in meeting such appeals, however obnoxious the peculiarities of the denomination soliciting aid, may be. In the present instance, advantage has not been taken of this custom, not from any doubt of success, but because it has been remembered that, in close connexion with the injunction, "Bear ye one another's burdens"—stands another, "Let every man bear his own burden."

'Of the fourteen persons who first formed the Unitarian society in Philadelphia, only three remain among its members; seven are dead, three have removed, and one has withdrawn.

'We cannot close this article, without adverting very briefly to the prospects of Liberal opinions in the large and prosperous city in which the society that has now been the subject of notice, is established. Upon this point we will make only one remark. You can scarcely hear a sermon in the principal churches of Philadelphia, that does not contain some reference or allusion to Rational Christianity. One would think, from the frequency and severity with which Unitarianism is attacked, that it is as rank here as it is in Boston. Is it possible, you would ask, that one small society can attract so much notice. You would greatly err in supposing this to be the case. The probable truth is, that there is hardly a congregation in the city in which this heresy is not beginning to germinate.'

'*William Turner.*—We have thought proper to mention, in connexion with

the above, a singular instance of integrity exhibited by the person whose name stands prefixed, and who was long a devoted member of the Unitarian society in Philadelphia. The whole character of this individual bore the genuine marks of christian excellence. His last illness and his death, which occurred last summer, made a sensible impression upon those who witnessed them, and who were strangers to his religious views. But the circumstances respecting him, which we wish particularly to record, are the following. He left England in embarrassed circumstances. By great industry and economy, he was not only able to support himself comfortably here, but also to satisfy all the demands against him in his native country. His English creditors, in consideration of his uprightness, sent him over a silver cup. His daughter, his only near relative, informed a respected member of the Unitarian society that she never heard of the existence of this testimonial of her father's integrity from himself, and never saw it until after his death, when it was found concealed among things of little value! Who, in such a case, would not have indulged himself with the gratification of a daughter's congratulations?'

Suppression of Intemperance.—The following letter, which is given in the fourth number of the Unitarian, published at New York, is one of the most valuable documents that has appeared upon the subject. 'It is in the form of a letter,' says the conductor of that work, 'from the superintendent of the Rhode Island coal mines, to the president of the Company, P. J. Schuyler, Esq. giving a detailed account of his entire success, in his attempts to abolish the use of ardent spirits among the colliers. It is one of the strongest cases we have known, and Mr Clowes is entitled to the thanks of every Christian, and of every lover of his country and of man, for his persevering zeal. It shows what an immense moral power is lodged in the hands of every man, who has under his superintendence a body of the laboring and manufacturing classes, and how accessible they generally are to reason, if they are approached in a spirit of kindness, and their own real and permanent good is seen to be the only motive in depriving them of what they have been accustomed to regard, either as a necessary stimulant, or the only attainable luxury of the poor man.'

'Portsmouth, March 3d, 1828.

'To PHILIP J. SCHUYLER, ESQ.

'Dear Sir,—Agreeably to your request, I send you a few particulars, detailing a very few among the many results, arising from discontinuing the use of spirituous liquors among the workmen. It perhaps would not be interesting to you, nor is it convenient for me, to give you a very minute account of what I have experienced in this way. If I understand you correctly, you wish to know what has been the effect produced here, by excluding grog from the works, and also from the workmen's houses—and also, to inform you as to the manner in which this was brought about, and apparently to the satisfaction of all parties. Previously to entering into the details of what has been done here, permit me to inform you, that this work of reforming workmen, from dram-drinking and habitual drunkenness, is not new to me. I have been about eighteen years actively engaged in breaking up old customs, stemming the common prejudices and habits of workmen, and when speaking of the work collectively, I have six different times proved victorious; and by the blessing of Him who aids his own cause, I have triumphed over many an old and stubborn profligate, as individual cases. I have in my family journal many memorandums of time, place, and name, of such particular instances.

'From the beginning of the year 1810 to this day, I have been the open and undisguised enemy to giving workmen liquor under any circumstances; and the more I am concerned with workmen, the firmer I am established in my opinion. At the first colliery I was appointed superintendent, there were about eighty men and boys employed. The owners, Messrs Morris and Kinnersly, were each of my opinion, and supported me in all my plans. In about two years, we had but few men or boys who would either drink, or permit drink to be taken at their pits or houses. Adjoining our works, was the largest colliery in that section of the country, called Kideren Colliery, belonging to the Gilbert family, and carried on by John Gilbert, Esq. who, unhappily for his workmen, believed and encouraged the idea, that the more extravagant and ignorant a workman was, he was the better servant, and always a dependant on his employers. In 1812 he (Mr. Gilbert) died. Morris and Kinnersly dissolved partnership; and Mr. Kinnersly purchased the Kideren Colliery, and

combined the two works into one concern, and appointed me to the chief superintendency. At this Kideren work, we found upwards of three hundred men and boys, in the most miserable and unhappy condition, and all the effects of dram-drinking and habitual drunkenness. St. Paul's language, Romans, chap. iii, from tenth to nineteenth verse, describes their situation much better than I can. Their Sundays and other time not employed at the colliery, were devoted to cock-fighting, bull-baiting, gambling in all its forms suited to their station, and to every vice attached to a life of dissipation. What I saw achieved at this colliery in the way of reformation, in the short space of three years, has so confirmed me in my principles, that I have never once since doubted of effecting a change, nor have I ever failed; and since that time, I have triumphed over four other works, but little better than Kideren; and if I am spared a little longer at these mines, I confidently expect the same satisfactory results. In 1813–14, the first year we had the Kideren works, our accidents and killed were much less than previous years; and *ours* averaged, killed 3—serious accidents 27 per month, for the first twelve months. In the year 1816, we had but one killed, and seventy-two accidents in twelve months. In the year 1816, on the very ground once used for cock-fights, &c. we had erected a large brick chapel, built with the donations from these same colliers. In 1815, we had three Sunday schools established, and the teachers, male and female, selected from the workmen and their daughters. And in the same year, we established a benevolent club, which was managed principally by the workmen. The original articles are now before me. In all this great work, the language, you *shall*, or, I *insist*, &c. was never once used; but every man had the credit of reforming at his own free will—there was no compulsion. And the same course I have pursued in every other instance where I have had the charge of mines; and have brought to pass a complete change, lasting in its effects, and this in different countries.

'At last the vicissitudes of fortune brought me to the Rhode-Island coal mines. When I first came here, it is not unknown to you and others, that the workman who could not, and did not drink his pint of whiskey per day, was not allowed to work, but sent adrift; besides extra liquor brought upon the works, and sent to their houses, and that too by the person whose duty it was to have prevented it. Not a week passed without a general combat of from twenty to thirty at a time, engaged with staves, spades, picks, axes, and any other weapon next at hand, to the great danger of each others' lives, and to the ruin of the works. All this was the effect of the usual allowance of grog. In the latter part of 1826, you, together with the ex-committee, appointed me to the superintendency of these mines; and I ask you yourself to bear testimony to the improved state of the works and workmen. Early in 1827 I commenced a general revolution, with a determination to do away with the worst of all evils, and the greatest curse ever inflicted on a workman, that of allowing him liquor while at work, and permitting him to have it in his house. I should have accomplished our wishes much sooner, had it not been for several unforeseen accidents in working among the old works filled with water. But keeping steady to the point, I had the satisfaction to see my plans gradually bearing down the long cherished habit, and a very perceptible improvement take place in every family. And on the first Monday in October last, every man came up to the counting-house, and with one voice, of their own free will, desired me to cease to give out any more grog.—They had always considered liquor a part of their wages, and had relinquished it without asking an equivalent. In order, therefore, to repay this sacrifice on their part, and to encourage such good deeds, I did at that time what policy pointed out to be my duty; and accordingly, I there and then informed them, I had the Company's authority, to add to their wages more than an equivalent for what they had given up, by advancing their wages from eighty-eight and a half, to ninety-two cents per day. Those families, who twelve months ago were clothed in rags, and with not a week's provision beforehand, in December last, were, both man, woman, and child, well clothed, and three months' provision beforehand; besides cash in hand, none having less than twenty, and some near one hundred dollars; not one on the sick list, but every soul in excellent health. Twelve months ago, our young single men had but one poor ragged suit of clothes each, and were generally in debt. Last December they had each two, and one of them three

suits of good clothes, and from fifty to one hundred dollars in cash each. During the winter, two have taken to themselves wives; and it gives me great pleasure to say, I believe they will be happy and do well. Two of our young men you have had with you during the winter in the coal yard, and you can judge of their conduct, as respects liquor and behaviour. When liquor was allowed at the works, it was no unusual occurrence for the mother and children to be unmercifully beaten, and turned out of doors at night. And for several months my house door was left unlocked at nights, to afford them a place of refuge. Since October last, not one single occurrence of this nature has taken place. Every family belonging to our works, not only looks well, clean, and cheertul, but several of the wives of the workmen have lately told me, that they never lived so happily as they have done since the grog was excluded from the works. All is not yet done that ought to be, in the way of reformation, but the principal point has been gained, and I have no doubt of shortly having a well organized work, and that all will work together for good.

'How this has been brought about, and so done that the workmen have the credit of every change effected, is what you wish to know. It would be difficult for me to make known in writing the way in which all this has been done, and yet the men content, if I was writing to any other person except yourself, who have had to do with workmen for many years. My first and main point was, to be a living example of all I wished them to be. For this purpose, I not only excluded spirits, but wine from my house. The next great thing was to keep them at home in the evenings, and so occupy their leisure time agreeably and profitably. For this purpose I engaged a schoolmaster during the winter evenings, to teach them to read, write, &c.; and sent all to school, *young* and *old*, *man*, *boy*, and *girl*; made the school room comfortable with fire, and gave to all, paper, pens, &c. Early in the spring I allotted to each house an unlimited garden, which occupied their leisure time during the summer, and in this way employed them fully, leaving no time for carousing. In the month of May, I prevailed on those with large families, to buy a cow and pig each, and to plant extra quantities of potatoes. To those who had not money I lent it, and entered into an agreement with them all, that if any of them should leave the works *by my wish*, (that is, if I discharged them) I would take all in their gardens, their cows, &c. at a valuation; but if they left the works by their own act and deed, then they must seek a market elsewhere. Thus, by a little at a time, each man became interested in the welfare of the mines, and gave me great influence over them. During fishing time, I sent a boy each Friday to catch fish for every house. I also doctored them and their families free of cost, and made it my chief study to anticipate all the little wants in an increasing family. By acting thus, and doing an hundred other little *unmentionable* things, I gained their esteem, which was of the utmost consequence in bringing about my plans. During all this time, I never lost an opportunity of expressing my own, and the Company's wish, that *they* would cease taking grog; and took care to set the thing in a pleasing manner before them, as to the credit they would gain by giving it up; and explained the great difference between having it stopped, and their desiring it might not be given out. They frequently—that is *some* of them—told me to stop it. This I refused to do, till they *all* united and ordered it stopped; giving as the reason, that by my stopping it without all consented, it would be doing them an injustice, as well as the Company: first, I should injure them in depriving them of the credit of having ordered it stopped themselves; and second, by making it appear that the Company was arbitrary; I told them that whatever was done, must be by mutual consent—no compulsion. In addition to this, I took advantage of every case of sickness, accident, or when alone with any one of the leading men, to expatiate on the awful effects of dram-drinking, showing it to be a devil to the soul, a thief to the pocket, a wife's woe, and children's sorrow, &c.; and on the other hand, pointing out the good to be enjoyed by wholly relinquishing the habit, the benefit to both soul and body, the happiness and comfort in their families, their better appearance in society, and the effects on their characters, &c.; and when on these topics, I did not spare in colouring; and at all times endeavoured to suit the conversation to the occasion, yet doing all in a persuasive manner, heaping coals of fire on their heads, not to burn them, but melt them down. My paper reminds me that I must stop, al-

though I have not told half. Yet you will be able to comprehend, in a great measure, all my proceedings. But should it not be what you wish, pray write again.

'And for the present, believe me to remain, your obedient servant,

JOHN CLOWES.'

'P. S. I must not allow this to go without telling you another thing I did to induce the men to give up the grog, and which operated very powerfully. That was, I preferred the man who drank the least, to every favorable situation, and made him my confidant, proclaiming it through the whole, that I had no confidence in a dram-drinker. And when I engaged Mr. Young, who is a water drinker, and by far the best and ablest workman, I immediately made him second in command, and gave him power to discharge. This took just as I calculated, and produced what I have mentioned the first week in October last. I could state a hundred things more, but have neither time nor room; only what I say about myself, having no liquor or any wine in my house, I beg particularly to call your attention to, as to the effect of my example, &c.'

Unitarian Mission at Calcutta.—Mr Adam, as we stated some time since, has relinquished his secular employments at Calcutta, and is now a Unitarian Missionary. We have before us his correspondence with the English and American Unitarians, which preceded, and must have done much to promote his appointment. No one can read it without a feeling of strong personal interest in the writer, and a no less strong conviction of his fitness for his arduous and responsible station. We regret that we cannot publish the whole series of letters, and that we must at present content ourselves with a single extract. It is from a letter to the Rev. Mr Fox of London, and is as follows:—

'But the English Unitarians, you say, want the encouragement of facts. To this I answer, that they have the encouragement of facts.

'1. There exists in Calcutta a Committee of gentlemen, European and Native, formed for the express purpose of promoting genuine Christianity. There are three other dissenting bodies in Calcutta, two Baptist and one Independent; and notwithstanding the much greater number of years since they commenced their labors, they do not all together possess so many respectable, wealthy, liberal, and intelligent members as the Unitarian Committee alone contains; and not one of them has a rich or learned Native among them, while the Unitarian Committee has at least three such Natives, besides several others on whose cooperation we may depend.'

'2. In connexion with this Committee, a subscription has been opened for the formation of a Permanent Fund, from the interest of which a minister or missionary may be supported, and his family provided for, in constant succession, and to this fund they have subscribed 25,000, and are willing to pledge themselves for 30,000, if the remaining moiety to make up 60,000 rupees can be obtained from any other quarter. Contrast this with what the friends and converts of the other missionaries have done for their teachers. Of *all* the missionaries, there is only *one* who derives *part* of his support from the gratuitous contributions of his hearers. The remainder is made up by pew rents. The whole sum is a small pittance, scarcely sufficient for a bare subsistence, and before he would accept of this mode of support, he obtained the sanction of his Society, in order that he might return upon their funds in the event of a deficiency. With this single exception, there is not a missionary in Bengal, who derives any portion of his support from those to whom he ministers, and I have therefore the greater pleasure in pointing your attention to the *fact*, that the Unitarians here, in the very infancy of their cause, have conceived and half executed the noble project above detailed, for the support of their minister.

'3. A subscription has been opened for the erection of a Unitarian Chapel; the subscriptions amount to 12,000 rupees. The ground has been purchased, and when we can show the public, by commencing the building, that we are in earnest, I have no doubt that the subscriptions may be increased by several thousands.

'4. There is a Charity School entirely supported by Rammohun Roy, at an expense of 300 rupees per month, in addition to all his other contributions to the Permanent Fund, Chapel Fund, &c. &c. and in which 80 Hindoo youths are taught the elements of knowledge, and would learn, without prejudice, whatever a Unitarian missionary could or would teach.

'5. There is another institution which I may here bring to your notice. Rammohun Roy has built a small, but very neat and handsome College, which he calls the Vedant College, in which a few youths are at present instructed, by a very eminent Pundit, in Sungskrit literature, with a view to the propagation and defence of *Hindoo* Unitarianism. With this institution he is also willing to connect instructions in European science and learning, and in *Christian* Unitarianism, provided the instructions are communicated in the Bengalee or Sungskrit language. What an admirable opening to your missionaries! Happy, thrice happy, and honored the man who has the ability, and the inclination, and the means to avail himself of it!

'6. There is a Unitarian Press, also the property of Rammohun Roy, at which several pamphlets and tracts have been, and continue to be printed, almost all bearing on the Unitarian controversy, or tending to promote philanthropic objects. The last original publication printed at this Press, is a Bengalee Grammar in the English language, by Rammohun Roy, which, although its arrangement is defective, throws much new light on the idioms and construction of the Bengalee, and may therefore be considered as a valuable present to all who make the acquisition of that language a study, and particularly to those missionaries who labor in Bengal, or who may hereafter be sent for that purpose.

'7. Besides the European members of the Committee, there are various individuals in the different ranks of European society, who are either Unitarians, or are in a greater or less degree friendly to their objects. Scarcely a month passes without my hearing of, or becoming acquainted with, either personally or by correspondence, some person of this description, who had been previously altogether unknown to me in that character. Rammohun Roy has lately received an anonymous letter from Bombay, starting controversial difficulties, seeking for information, and evidently showing that the mind of the writer is opening to rational views of Christianity. Is it not probable from these circumstances, that a spirit of inquiry has spread farther than we could have anticipated from the small amount of exertion to produce it? From the conflictings, not of different sects merely, but of different religions, from the liberty and respect which the Government of the country accords even to idolatry and Mahometanism, from the infant state of the Church Establishment, and the comparative liberality of some of its members, and from other causes which I cannot here detail, the prejudices of the Christian population are necessarily much weakened, and ample encouragement is given to free and unfettered investigation.

'8. Besides the Native members of the Committee, there is a distinct class of the Native community which professes Hindoo Unitarianism. I have elsewhere described this class, and I therefore merely add here, that the great exertions made by Government and by individuals, by Europeans and Natives, by Orthodox and Heterodox, to diffuse education, have tended to the increase of this class, and that even institutions under exclusively Orthodox management, have, to my certain knowledge, sent forth Native youths, not only opponents to idolatry, and believers in one God, but decidedly friendly to *Christian* Unitarianism.'

Letter from Mr Adam of Calcutta.—The following note from Dr Tuckerman, contains extracts from the first letter that has been received from Mr Adam since his entering upon the active labors of his mission.

'To the Editor of the Christian Examiner.

'Sir,—I have great pleasure in being able to tell you that, by a late arrival from Calcutta, I have received a letter from the Rev. Mr Adam, in which he tells me, that he has been successful in exciting the attention of the community there, to the claims of pure Christianity, to an extent beyond his most sanguine expectations. He says, "the English morning service, which I commenced in August, was very indifferently attended. But an evening course of lectures, which I began on the first Sunday of that month, has been numerously and respectably attended. The subject of the lectures is the doctrine of the divine unity, in all its aspects and relations to Trinitarianism, to Polytheism, &c. * * * When I speak of our service being *numerously* attended, I mean, with reference to our expectations, and to the congregations which usually assemble in Calcutta churches and chapels. * * * But, besides the mere attendance, there is a spirit of inquiry abroad, the effects of which I will not venture to anticipate. Several persons, formerly Trinitarians, have avow-

ed themselves Unitarians; and within a month our subscription list for general and incidental expenses, has risen from thirty or forty rupees a month, to one hundred and fifty per month. Nor is the amount thus subscribed made up of large sums, from a few wealthy individuals; but of small sums, from about thirty different persons. * * * About the middle of October, also, I began a course of familiar lectures on the first principles of religion, to a small congregation of Natives, but all of them respectable and intelligent, and affording their voluntary attendance at a fixed hour on a stated day. * * * Cannot you send me a coadjutor in the labors in which I am engaged? * * * I will only add, that my hands are full of work, and that my heart is full of hope; and that I feel myself happy, and useful, and grateful to the merciful providence of God, for all the way in which he has led me."

'This intelligence, I doubt not, will gladden many, as it certainly does

'Yours, very truly,

JOSEPH TUCKERMAN.

'April, 1828.'

Rammohun Roy and Mr Adam's Writings.—At the meeting held in Boston for the promotion of a Unitarian mission to Bengal, it may be remembered by those present, or who read the reports of the doings of the assembly, that Mr Newton, who had for some time resided at Calcutta, insinuated, if he did not directly assert, that the several Appeals which have appeared under the name of Rammohun Roy, were not the actual compositions of that distinguished individual, but of another person, an English gentleman of high character and standing at Calcutta. We have at this moment in our hands a letter from that gentleman, Dr Gordon, which, in the strongest terms, denies the truth of the whole statement.

Mr Newton made similar remarks respecting Mr Adam's replies to the questions of the Rev. Dr Ware of Cambridge, attributing these, also, to Dr Gordon. We have the evidence before us for pronouncing these remarks to be of the same character with those respecting Rammohun Roy. Everything else Mr Newton said, which was of a character to diminish public confidence in Mr Adam, is shown by documents before us to be equally unjust.

New Series of Unitarian Tracts.—We were pleased to see in the Christian Register for April 19th, the following communication from the Secretary of the American Unitarian Association.

'The Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association have voted to publish a second series of tracts of a more popular character and cheaper execution than the first series. They will appear in the duodecimo form, and be paged for binding in volumes, and will be furnished to members of the Association. Tracts will be reprinted that have already been extensively read, and therefore have not been included in the first series, but for which there is a demand from places where Unitarianism is a less familiar subject than in this vicinity. The former series in duodecimo will be continued.'

Unitarian Library.—From a circular of the American Unitarian Association, we learn that measures are to be taken to collect Unitarian books and pamphlets, and that contributions to this object are solicited. 'Our wish,' say the Executive Committee, 'is to form a Library in which copies of all books, pamphlets, sermons, periodicals, and religious papers, the purpose of which is to explain, defend, or enforce Unitarian views of Christianity, may be preserved. Volumes, old and new, tracts and manuscripts, will be acceptable. Especially should we be glad to form a collection of works by which the history of Unitarianism in this country may be illustrated.*** We need not mention the benefits that may result from such a Library or Repository as it is proposed to establish. They will readily occur. We will only allude to the fact, that no such collection is now in existence, or, if there be, it is not generally known, and is not open for the public good.'

Test and Corporation Acts.—On the 26th of February, Lord John Russell made a motion in the British House of Commons, that the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider the subject of a repeal of the celebrated Test and Corporation Acts. The vote was 237 for, and 193 against it, giving to the friends of religious freedom a majority of 44. This majority, says the London Times, 'is in truth what may be called a thundering event. It will sound from one end of the kingdom to the other, and the echo will be heard in foreign

parts.' It is indeed a signal triumph of justice and reason over bigotry and oppression.

A faithful outline of the nature, history, and operation of these Acts, is given in Lord John Russell's speech on submitting his motion. The following is the account of them by Blackstone; Commentaries, Book IV. Chap. 4. § 3.

'In order the better to secure the established church against perils from nonconformists of all denominations, infidels, turks, jews, heretics, papists, and sectaries, there are however two bulwarks erected; called the *corporation* and *test* acts: by the former of which no person can be legally elected to any office relating to the government of any city or corporation, unless, within a twelvemonth before, he has received the sacrament of the Lord's supper according to the rites of the church of England; and he is also enjoined to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy at the same time that he takes the oath of office; or, in default of either of these requisites, such election shall be void. The other, called the test act, directs all officers, civil and military, to take the oaths and make the declaration against transubstantiation, in any of the king's courts at Westminster, or at the quarter sessions, within six calendar months after their admission: and also within the same time to receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper, according to the usage of the church of England, in some public church immediately after divine service and sermon, and to deliver into court a certificate thereof signed by the minister and churchwarden, and also to prove the same by two credible witnesses; upon forfeiture of 500*l.* and disability to hold the said office.'

It is true, that the Acts have been a little modified, and that annual Acts of Indemnity are passed, by which the penalties of the Corporation and Test Acts are remitted, and that granted as a favor which is claimed as an inalienable right. But this ought not and does not satisfy a high-minded nation, a decided majority of which is believed to consist of Dissenters from the *Established* faith.

Irish Protestantism.—At the annual meeting of the Synod of Ulster in June last, a motion was made to deprive the Rev. Mr Porter of his office as Clerk to that body. He had faithfully discharged his official duties for eleven years, and, according to the usual terms of appointment, was to hold the office for life, or during good behaviour. The only reason assigned for so extraordinary a measure as that proposed, was, that Mr Porter had avowed Unitarian opinions. The attempt was unsuccessful, 59 voting for, and 91, against it. The Protestant inhabitants of the town which is the scene of his ministerial labors, were unwilling, it seems, to share with the minority of the Synod, the disgrace of so open a violation of Protestant principles, and, as we learn from the Christian Pioneer for February last, assembled in the Town Hall, Newtownlimavady, on the 18th of December, for the purpose of presenting Mr Porter with a Service of Plate. 'Dr Moore, on the part of the Protestant inhabitants, read the following address:—

"To the Rev. William Porter.

"*Rev. and Dear Sir,*—We, members of the different Protestant Congregations in the town and neighbourhood of Newtownlimavady, request your acceptance of a Service of Plate, as a mark of our sincere regard and esteem. We feel great pleasure in declaring, that we recognise in you the exercise of those Christian virtues, without which, profession is but a name. We recognise in you, Sir, an indulgent parent, an affectionate husband, a kind master, and a sincere friend; with a morality unspotted, a candor and adherence to truth unsurpassed.

"Though some of us may entertain sentiments different from yours on certain doctrines, about which the wisest and best men have not been able to agree, yet we all perfectly concur in expressing our warm approbation of the impressive manner in which you have uniformly inculcated, both by precept and example, the practical duties of Christianity, and of your strenuous advocacy, and manly exercise of the right of private judgment in the formation of religious opinions.

"We feel ourselves called on to express our disapprobation of the attempt made at the last meeting of Synod, to deprive you of the Clerkship of that body, merely because you had the candor to avow, and the consistency to adhere to theological opinions which you believed to be right. We, however, rejoice, that that attempt was defeated by the good sense and good feeling of the body.

"Whilst we admire and applaud that elevated spirit and unbending integrity,

which, in opposition to the seductive suggestions of worldly wisdom, prompted your conduct on that occasion, we marvel that in the present enlightened age and country, such conduct should have incurred the censure of some of your brethren in the ministry. We cannot help lamenting, that teachers of the Gospel should have departed so widely from its forbearing and charitable spirit, and that men, calling themselves Presbyterians, should have evinced so little regard for what we deem the fundamental principles of their church; namely, *the right of private judgment, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as a rule of faith.*

"With the most ardent wishes for your happiness here, and your acceptance hereafter, through the blessed Redeemer, we take the liberty of subscribing ourselves your affectionate friends."

'To the above Address, Mr Porter replied:—

"*Mr Chairman*,—I do assure you, and my other friends, that with very few persons indeed, would I at this moment exchange my feelings. During the course of last summer, there was a time, I confess, when my spirit was nearly subdued, and when I thought I should be borne down by obloquy, merely for having expressed opinions, which, however erroneous they may be deemed, can have emanated from no other source than conscientious conviction. But that time is past. I have found that there are liberal-minded men of every church, and of every creed, who will not allow an individual, whose intentions are upright, to be run down by vulgar clamor. The approbation of the persons whose names are subscribed to that address, more than compensates for all the injurious imputations to which I have been subjected; they are persons whose social, moral, and intellectual respectability, cannot be called in question. *These* articles are not begrimed, as such things have sometimes been, by the filthiness of the hands which present them. It affords me additional gratification, to reflect that this mark of your regard has not been earned by subserviency to popular prejudices, or by fomenting sectarian and political animosities. By ministering to the dissemination of jealousy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, it is easy for any one to obtain applause from the misjudging multitude; but the approbation of the wise and worthy cannot thus be conciliated. That right of private judgment, which you are pleased to give me credit for vindicating and exercising, I do most willingly allow to all my fellow Christians. Though perfectly conscious that the commendation of my conduct as a man, a minister, and a member of Synod, is much exaggerated; yet I do not hesitate to acknowledge, that this very exaggeration is gratifying to my feelings; for it is kindness which has biassed your judgment.

"The pecuniary value of these things, considerable as it is, constitutes only a small portion of their worth: neither silver nor gold did I expect to bequeath to my children, but these memorials of your esteem and friendship, it shall be my study to transmit to them unsullied, and I trust they will duly appreciate the legacy. To you, Mr Chairman, and my other friends, I return heartfelt thanks. Most sincerely do I wish, that it may be well with you now, and eternally well with you hereafter."

'On the Tea-pot and Coffee-Urn, is the following inscription, beautifully engraven:—"Presented to the Rev. WILLIAM PORTER, by his Protestant Friends, of different denominations, in Newtownlimavady and its vicinity, as a mark of their high esteem for his many amiable qualities in private life; and their cordial approbation of his fearless and disinterested assertion of the invaluable RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.—1827."'

Ordination at Cambridge.—At Lechmere Point, on Wednesday, March 5th, the Rev. Warren Burton was ordained as pastor of the Third Congregational Society in Cambridge. The services were as follows;—Introductory Prayer, by Rev. Dr Lowell, of Boston; Reading of the Scriptures, by Rev. Mr Walker, of Charlestown; Sermon, by Rev. Mr Greenwood, of Boston; Ordaining Prayer, by Rev. Mr Beede, of Wilton, N. H.; Charge, by Rev. Dr Ware, of Cambridge; Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr Barrett, of Boston; Concluding Prayer, by Rev. T. B. Gannett, of Cambridgeport.

New Church in Philadelphia.—We regret we have no room for the Memorial and Address delivered on the occasion of laying the corner stone of a new church for the Unitarian Society in Philadelphia, whose history is given

above. The ceremony was performed on Tuesday, the 25th of March, with the customary religious services. After a prayer by the Rev. James Taylor, the stone was laid by Messrs Ralph Eddowes and John Vaughan. Mr Eddowes then read a paper cotaining an abstract of the history of the Society, with the names of the architect, William Strickland, of the principal mechanics and the building Committee, with an appropriate expression of the purposes for which the house is to be erected, all of which, written upon parchment, was inclosed and deposited in the stone by Mr John Vaughan. The Pastor, the Rev. W. H. Furness, then made an address to those assembled on the occasion, and the services were closed with prayer by the Rev. Mr Stetson of Medford, Mass.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

GREAT BRITAIN.—The new ministry, under the Duke of Wellington, appears to be firmly established. The declared basis on which the members of it were invited to take their offices, in regard to some of the leading questions of policy, was the same as that on which the very successful administration of Lord Liverpool was formed, and on which Mr Canning and Lord Goderich organized the cabinet; but it differs from the two last cabinets, in excluding persons belonging to the old whig party. The head of this ministry, and other members of the greatest influence, are opposed to the Catholic claims, but a majority of the members are in favor of them. The public curiosity having been a good deal excited respecting the causes of the dissolution of the late cabinet, several explanations were made in both houses of parliament, early in the session. The dissolution appears to have arisen from a trifling personal difference between two of the members—a difference which would have been of very little moment, had it not shown an uncomfortable degree of jealousy, on the part of the tory party, of the influence of the whigs. The present government has distinctly declared its intention of adhering to the principles of the treaty of July 6, relative to the affairs of Greece, but they have exhibited greater anxiety to preserve peace with Turkey, than appears to have been felt by their predecessors. They came into power too late, however, to take any measures to avert the rupture of the negotiations at Constantinople, and there is reason to believe that they will continue to act in strict concert, and cordial understanding with Russia and France.

FRANCE.—In the French Legislative Chamber, no measures have yet been adopted, since the opening of the session, to show very clearly the present political character of those bodies. The candidates for the presidency of the Chamber of Deputies, elected by the Chambers, to be presented to the King, were part royalists, and part liberals. Royer Collard, of the Liberal party, but a man of great moderation, a friend of the constitutional charter, and a man of distinguished talents, received the appointment.

TURKEY.—The Ottoman government having been, from the date of the battle of Navarin, vigorously engaged in making preparations for defence, and having protracted the negotiations with the Ambassadors of Russia, France, and Great Britain, as long as was practicable, consistently with its determination not to accede to the demands of those Powers, on the 12th of January threw off all pacific appearances, and issued a manifesto, in which the demands of the allied powers are ascribed to the desire of the christian nations, and particularly of Russia, to ruin the Sublime Porte, to overthrow the Ottoman empire, and to exterminate Islamism. It charges Russia with having instigated the Greek insurrection, and represents the interest expressed by the allies in favor of the liberties of the Greeks, as a mere pretence, to favor the project of destroying the Mussulman nation. In reference to the proposition of the allies, that the Porte should give to the Greeks a form of independent government, and a chief of their own nation, as in Wallachia and Moldavia, on condition of their paying an annual tribute, the manifesto declares, that 'neither reason, nor law, nor policy, nor religion, could admit of such propositions being accepted.' After narrating the course of the negotiations, and the efforts after the

battle of Navarin, to induce the ambassadors to recede from their demands, the manifesto declares, that 'if at present, after having witnessed such conduct, and been asked such conditions, we were to give way, and to concede the independence of the Greeks, the contagion would soon extend to all the Greeks settled in Romelia and Anatolia, without the possibility of arresting the evil. They would all pretend to the same independence; they would renounce their duties as Rayahs, and, triumphing in a year or two over the generous Mussulman nation, they would finish one day, by suddenly imposing laws upon us, (God preserve us from it!) and the ruin of our religion and our empire would be the inevitable result. Whilst, thanks to God! the numerous provinces of Europe and Asia are filled with an immense Mussulman population, does the sacred book and does our law permit us, through fear of war, to let our religion be trodden under foot, and to deliver ourselves to the Infidels from hand to hand, our country, our wives, our children, our goods, and our property?'

It proceeds to call to mind the victories that have been won by the Mussulman nation, since the time of their great Prophet, and how many thousand times, united in heart for the defence of religion, they have put thousands of Infidels to the sword. The people are called upon, in case the three powers shall not desist from their demands, to place themselves under the protection of their holy Prophet, and to unite in a single corps for the defence of religion and the empire. 'This war is not,' the manifesto concludes, 'like all former wars, a political conflict to acquire provinces or to settle frontiers. The object of the Infidels is to annihilate Islamism, and to tread under foot the Mussulman nation. It must, therefore, be considered purely as a religious and national war. Let all the Faithful, rich or poor, great or small, know that to fight is the duty of us all. Let them not dream of a monthly pay, or of any pay whatever; far from it, let us sacrifice our property and our persons; let us fulfil with zeal all the duties which the honor of Islamism imposes upon us; let us unite our efforts, and labor with heart and soul for the maintenance of religion until the day of judgment. Mussulmans have no other means of obtaining salvation, either in this world or the next. We hope that the Most High will vouchsafe to confound and disperse in every quarter, the Infidels, foes to our religion and our empire, and that, in all times, in all places, and in all cases, he will grant victory to the Faithful. Our true position being thus known to all Mussulmans, there is no doubt that, if they have the least faith and piety, they will also know their duty; they will unite heart and soul to maintain our religion and our empire, as well as to ensure their own salvation in this world and the next; and that, if the occasion requires it, they will discharge with zeal and valor the varied functions of the war, and fulfil exactly the duties imposed upon us by our Holy Laws. Help comes from God!'

The latest authentic accounts from Constantinople are to Jan. 26. The manifesto had been read in all the mosques, the Bosphorus had been closed against the ships of all christian nations, all Franks, with a very few special exceptions, had been required to withdraw from Constantinople, and measures of great severity had been adopted against the Armenian Christians, subjects of the empire. The effect of these measures upon Russia, and the other allied powers, had not been ascertained. It remains to be seen, whether the Russian army will cross the Pruth, and whether other hostile measures will be adopted by the allied powers. France was at the last dates reinforcing her fleet in the Levant.

GREECE.—Count Capo D'Istria has sailed from Malta for Ægina, but the news of his arrival has not yet reached us. The last accounts from Scio represent the castle, which was yet held by the Turks, as likely to surrender in a few days, on which event the whole island would be in possession of the Greeks. A part of the Egyptian troops have been withdrawn from the Morea, and have landed at Alexandria. It was expected that the remainder would soon embark, for the purpose of returning to Egypt. Patras was blockaded by a steamboat and other Greek vessels.

From other countries of Europe we have received but little information of moment, since the date of our last publication. Don Miguel has arrived at Lisbon, and assumed the regency of Portugal, but no particular account of his proceedings has yet reached us.

MEXICO.—Although the late revolt in

Mexico was promptly suppressed, and the two leaders of the insurrection, Bravo, the Vice President, and Barragan, Governor of the State of Vera Cruz, are held in prison, awaiting their trial, the government does not appear to have vigor enough to restore a healthy state of the finances, or wisdom enough to introduce a system of measures favorable to the operations of trade. No measures have been taken to restore the credit of the nation abroad, nor to repair the mischiefs resulting from the banishment of the Spaniards.

CENTRAL AMERICA.—The civil war in Guatemala is not yet terminated. At the last accounts several thousand men were in the field. The British Consul at Guatemala, Mr Reilly, was lately murdered in his own house, by his servant. The murderer was arrested, tried, and shot.

SOUTH AMERICA.—The state of affairs in Colombia had not improved, at the date of the last intelligence from that country. Little benefit was expected from the labors of the Congress at Ocana. The powers of the government appear to have been assumed by Bolivar, and it is possible his dictatorship will relieve the country from greater evils than it would be subject to, under the reign of discord which would prevail but for his presence. The war between Buenos Ayres and Brazil is still continued, though it is prosecuted with little vigor. The blockade of Buenos Ayres is little more than nominal, though it subjects the inhabitants to great inconveniences and loss.

UNITED STATES.—The labors of Congress have not yet produced any measures of great importance, which have received the sanction of both houses. The House of Representatives has been for a long time engaged in the discussion of a bill for the increase of duties on the import of woolens, and other goods of foreign manufacture. It is yet uncertain whether it will pass that House, and still more what will be the judgment of the Senate upon it. A bill which passed the House of Representatives, after much debate, appropriating $30,000 for internal improvements, has been amended in the Senate by limiting the appropriation to the prosecution of surveys already begun. In our next publication, we shall probably be able to give some more satisfactory account of the labors of the session.

OBITUARY.

DIED, at Cambridge, February 25, Rev. GEORGE OTIS, Rector of Christ Church, in Cambridge, aged 30.

This notice is not given as a record of talents and virtues, which are common to all, but as a just tribute to peculiar mental and moral endowments. We are not willing that the accomplished scholar and valued minister of Christ, whose premature loss we are called to deplore, should pass away from the memory of the living, without one effort of ours to paint his character, and to show forth the bright example of the departed to those who remain.

Mr Otis was graduated at Harvard University in 1815. He pursued his theological studies in Cambridge, and after taking orders in the Episcopal church, was connected, for some years, with the College, as a member of the Immediate Government. In this relation he discharged the duties of a faithful and judicious instructer, and devoted himself, with peculiar zeal, to the improvement of his pupils.

He was acknowledged, by his literary associates, to be a learned and elegant scholar. His mind was of an original cast, and though distinguished for his classical attainments, rather than the variety of his productions, we think he may with justice be called a man of genius. His discriminating taste enabled him to read and study to great advantage, and to select and make his own, everything worth retaining.

The peculiar character of his mind was displayed in his writings, of which it is to be regretted he gave the public so few specimens. They were remarkable for novelty of thought, vivid language, and a beautiful and delicate imagery. His reading was not uncommonly

extensive, but select and exact. In this respect, he obeyed the precept of Pliny, which is quoted with approbation by Gibbon, 'to read much, rather than many things.' His duties as an instructer in the University, led him to a thorough study of the best ancient classics; and his own taste prompted him to a constant intercourse with the great writers of a later age. Milton and Dante were his chosen poets. With their gifted minds his communion was intimate and sincere. While he made their works the subjects of critical study, the task of the philologist was not permitted to blunt his perception of their beauties.

With his valuable literary acquisitions, Mr Otis maintained that freedom from affectation and display, which is always the companion of wisdom. He never departed from the simplicity of nature, through false ideas of refinement. He never indulged the pride of knowledge, for the dignity of his character was founded, not on learning, but on selfrespect. His conversation was brilliant and instructive. He always spoke from a full mind, and seldom failed to excite the thinking faculties of those who listened to him. The society of which he was so bright an ornament, will long remember the ease and gracefulness with which he engaged in the gravest discussions, and the charms which he gave to the most trifling details.

His mind was poetic. His feelings were refined, perhaps to a sensitive delicacy. True and deep sentiment cast a soft and hallowed light over every thought and expression. Upon this part of his character our inclination would lead us long to dwell, were it not sacrilegious to open so sacred a sanctuary to the uninterested gaze of the world.

His love of nature was fervent. It filled his mind and heart. Every new beauty he discerned, was to him a revelation of the power and goodness of God. Music, too, was his companion and friend. His love of music was so peculiar and beautiful a trait in his character, that it cannot be passed without notice. He regarded it as the gift of God, and intimately connected with the expression of the holiest feelings. It was his amusement in his bright moments; his solace in his dark ones, and many he had; in all, it breathed to him a 'varied language,' which spoke to his ear, and inspired his heart.

From the singular delicacy of his mind, it will be understood, that Mr Otis was ill qualified to encounter the conflicts and trials of life. He was, however, appointed to the discipline of suffering. Few have been called to mourn over the loss of dearer friends. Few have endured the disappointment of holier hopes. His path was indeed rough, and of the many dark and heavy clouds that hung over it, there was scarcely one whose edges were illuminated; and had not his guiding star pointed to a region beyond the world, where he might rest his hopes, he would indeed have been desolate.

It remains to notice our departed friend, as a religious man and a christian minister. While connected with the University, his religious sentiments were different from those of most who surrounded him. He was strongly and conscientiously attached to the opinions of the Church of England; yet he was liberal in his feelings, and formed deep and lasting friendships with many who had adopted views opposite to his own. His heart was too full of good affections, to leave place for bigotry and exclusiveness. Whatever we may think of the truth of his speculative belief, we must acknowledge that it was not adopted without examination, nor can we complain that it was ever defended with acrimony. He loved to regard religion as a sentiment of the heart, and a rule of life, rather than a subject of controversy, or an occasion for discord. His devotion was fervent, but not extravagant; his zeal, glowing, but enlightened; his piety, earnest and deep, but retiring and gentle.

The most interesting view that can be taken of his character, is as the shepherd of his flock. In his connexion with his church, he was conscientious and unwearied; a counsellor in health, a comforter in sickness, and a devoted attendant at the bed of death; a gentle and interested guide of the young, a patient and untiring instructer of the child. He ever made his highest duty his chief pleasure. Can such a minister be taken from his people, and not be lamented with a deep and sincere sorrow? But, although they have committed his body to the grave, may his spirit still be their guide, and 'may they reinforce their virtues from the dust of him, who so lately taught them.'

'Go to the grave, in all thy glorious prime,
In full activity of zeal and power;
A Christian cannot die before his time,
The Lord's appointment is the servant's hour.'

Died, March 13th, Mrs Rebecca Phillips, wife of Jonathan Phillips, Esq. and daughter of the late Samuel Salisbury, Esq.

This excellent woman has left an enduring monument of herself in the hearts of all who were so happy as to know her. She is a remarkable example of the power which belongs to true goodness. We have never known a Christian more retiring, more averse to display, more silent in well doing. She shrunk from notice almost with timidity; and yet it would be hard to name an individual who has left stronger impressions of the reality and beauty of christian virtue.

She was deeply imbued with the principle of piety. Religion early took possession of her mind, and seemed a part of her very nature. She was not however enslaved to the impressions of education. As she advanced in life, she received higher views of christian truth, which evidently gave a firmer, calmer, nobler tone to her mind. Her religion had nothing of high and tumultuous excitement, and was far removed from clamorous profession. Whilst it touched and elevated the affections, it seemed to act with still greater energy on the conscience. She habitually recognised the voice of God in this inward monitor, listening to its lowest whisperings, and following obediently its slightest intimations. No feature of her character was more striking, than that delicacy of conscience, which feels a slight error as a wound, which shrinks from the appearance of evil, and which is ready to suspect guilt even in innocent infirmity. Duty was sacred in all its requisitions, and under a feeble frame she bore an invincible purpose of right action.

Her social affections flowed in a still, but deep and never failing stream. She felt that home was her sphere, and she moved in it shedding blessings with that gentle and silent agency which marks the beneficent operations of Providence. To say that she had a mother's boundless love, would be to bestow common praise. It is more important to observe, that her maternal affection never degenerated into injurious indulgence, and was distinguished by selfpossession, unwearied patience, and perseverance in what she accounted the best methods of forming the young mind. Her character forbade her to mingle much in general society. But the usefulness of individuals is not to be estimated so much by the extent as by the depth of their influence. It is possible to confer as much good by exerting a consoling, purifying, and strengthening power on a few minds, as by exercising a wider, but more superficial influence; and by this standard, the retired wife, mother, sister, and friend, may rank among the greatest benefactors on earth.

Mrs Phillips possessed an excellent understanding. To that sound judgment, which, in the domestic relations, is worth more than stores of learning, she joined a desire of general knowledge, and enriched her mind quietly and unostentatiously by reading. She took great pleasure in the works of God, and in books which treated of them. Perhaps the congeniality between such a mind as hers, and the tranquillity of nature, gave this direction to her inquiries.

Her character had the beauty of contrast. It joined qualities not easily reconciled. With sensibility, she united discretion and selfcontrol. Her firmness of principle was tempered by feminine gentleness. Her activity was at once noiseless and effective. With zeal to do good, she connected judiciousness and a wise caution in the selection of objects and means. Though singularly diffident, she was still equal to the most trying exigences of life. A principle of order and harmony seemed to pervade her mind, securing her against the excess to which even virtuous propensities are exposed, and giving the charm of consistency to her life.

We will only add, that she was to the last an improving character. Blameless and pure as was her youth, she was much more interesting in her maturer years. Her intellect seemed to manifest new life at a period when most minds seem to become stationary. Her virtues became of a stronger cast, without losing their delicacy. Life was to the last an improving blessing, a more precious gift. We know not a surer pledge of future progress, than that the character continues to rise, and to go forward even to the closing hour. This excellent woman has left this pure consolation to her friends. It requires little effort to conceive of the celestial happiness of such a being, in whom we saw heaven opening and growing brighter, until the cloud of mortality concealed her from our view.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—No. III.

MAY AND JUNE, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE HON. SAMUEL HOWE.

We wish to preserve some record of the virtue of the individual, whose recent loss our community has so deeply felt. Such men are not given us often. And when they leave us, we feel it to be a duty, if nothing more, to gather up the fruits of their lives, the benefits of their good examples, and add them to the common treasury of knowledge and virtue. In attempting this now, we are very anxious to avoid all extravagance. We dare not give full expression to our feelings; for we know that to many they would seem too strong. In such a case, it is better to come short, than to exceed the truth, or what others would consider the truth. It is better always; and particularly, when, as here, there is in the character itself which we are desirous of presenting, much to restrain us. We would not violate what we know would be the feelings of the man we love and honor. For if he possessed any one trait, to the strength of which, more than of others, all will bear testimony, it was that which would peremptorily forbid any approach to extravagance, in the performance of this sad duty.

In the life of Judge Howe, there was little of incident that claims attention. Yet it may be well, as a help to a proper understanding and fair estimate of his character, to give a brief outline of his history.

Samuel Howe was the son of the late Dr Estes Howe, a physician of Belchertown in the county of Hampshire. He was born in that place on the twentieth of June, 1785. He received his early education at the common town school, which at that time offered very few advantages. He very early discovered a love of reading and study, finding in them greater attractions than in the common amusements of his age. Books were not easily obtained, and he often rode several miles to procure them. There appeared, even then, marks of that regularity and economy of time, which were so observable in after life. At the age of twelve, he was placed at the academy in New Salem; and afterwards at Deerfield Academy, where he was prepared for college. He entered the sophomore class of Williamstown College, in 1801. The most that I have learned of this part of his life, is, that he maintained a most respectable standing in a class of great merit, was exemplary in all his conduct, and the object of high esteem. He is said to have been particularly fond of mathematics, and to have made more than common proficiency in those studies, considering his limited opportunities.

Immediately after receiving his degree, he began the study of law in the office of the Hon. Jabez Upham of Brookfield, where he remained about a year. He then entered the Law School at Litchfield, Connecticut, at that time under the superintendance of Chief Justice Reeves and Judge Gould. From this school he went to Stockbridge, and finished his preparatory studies in the office of Judge Sedgwick of that place. He was admitted to the Berkshire Bar in August, 1807, and commenced the practice of his profession in Stockbridge. Shortly after, he removed to Worthington in the county of Hampshire, where he soon distinguished himself as a lawyer and advocate, and had a large share of business. In 1820 he removed to Northampton, and in the following year was appointed one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, at the early age of thirtysix. And here I cannot forbear to mention, that the members of the bar in one of our counties, who at first were greatly displeased, and had loudly and formally expressed their displeasure, at the appointment of Mr Howe to this office, after seeing him one week on the bench, united in a public and most flattering expression of their entire satisfaction. It is well known that, in the duties of this responsible station he continued to the last, and that but a few weeks before his death, hastening probably that melancholy event, he gave proofs of indefatigable industry, and a fidelity which regarded not comfort, health, nor even life.

Beside those already mentioned, the subject of this notice held other honorable stations. Not long after his removal to Northampton, he associated himself with an eminent member of the bar in that place, for the establishment of the Law School, in the arduous duties of which he expended much of his strength, and the success of which is too well known to need any particular notice. He was early a member of our State Legislature; a place, however, of which he seems never to have been ambitious, professional and not political eminence being his aim. About four years since, he was made a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was also recently appointed by our Legislature to the Board of Trustees of Amherst College.

Such is a very general sketch of a life that has now closed. That so many high and responsible trusts were delegated to our friend, and so much public service was performed by him, in the space of twenty years, is of itself the highest encomium; and when we think of the fidelity and ability with which these trusts and duties were discharged, our admiration is surpassed only by our grief, that the influence of such a character and life is thus suddenly, and in its fulness, withdrawn. Many looks of anxious and painful interest, were fixed upon that strength as it began to fail. It was never firm, and for some months there had been strong indications of increasing weakness. Still the most arduous duties were performed with scrupulous fidelity. This could not continue. At the close of his last great effort, the exhausted frame sunk, and in three weeks the grave closed upon all that remained on earth of him, whose loss to many, very many, is the rending of one of life's strongest and tenderest chords. He died in Boston about midnight, on the nineteenth of January last.

In presenting the character of Judge Howe, our attention is first called to his *professional* worth. Of this, it may seem presumptuous in any one unacquainted with the science of law, to speak confidently. But there were prominent features in this character which none could overlook, and which require no peculiar talent to describe. Of these, one of the most remarkable, and that which led to every other, was his ardent *love* of the law. This existed from first to last in an uncommon degree. That, which to many who stand high in the profession is a dry and irksome study, was his delight. In the most abstract and uninteresting parts of it, he could always find a pleasure and even excitement, equal to that which is awakened by powerful

works of fiction. This was apparent in his whole private and public course, and was strong enough to remove many serious obstacles, and overpower even the sense of severe pain. For often, by this interest and excitement, aided by a high principle of duty, have we seen him sustained in the discharge of public functions, when suffering from severe bodily disease; sustained to the last moment of duty, and then sinking. This love of his profession, as it was the spring of great improvement, so did it yield him the greatest satisfaction; conferring its reward at every step, and most of all at the last, in the sober review of life.

It *was* the spring of great improvement, and profound learning was one of its natural effects. This is worthy of particular notice. I believe it is hazarding nothing to say, that very few men, in this or any country, have possessed, at his age, a more thorough knowledge of the law; certainly not one with only his advantages. His early instruction was very imperfect. The great defects of his classical education he was often heard to lament; and to the last there were occasional, though not frequent, appearances of carelessness in style, and want of strict accuracy in the use of language, which are said formerly to have been much more obvious. These he was every day overcoming, but they show how much there was to be overcome. And when to these defects in the early culture of his mind, we add the evils of a naturally feeble constitution, and the demands made upon his time and resources by a very early and more than usual portion of domestic care, we cannot but regard his attainments as uncommon. His legal knowledge was remarkable, not only for its extent, but also, and perhaps more, for its accuracy. His research was profound, patient, and thorough, and his memory very retentive. He read everything connected with his profession, which seemed worth the time, though not connected directly with his own duties; and all that he read was faithfully stored, and always at command. He was seldom at a loss for authorities or illustrations, name, place, or any important circumstance. At the bar and on the bench, in his arguments to the court, his charges to the jury, his exercises as a teacher, and in the performance of all his official duties, it is confidently believed that few have discovered more readiness, correctness, or extensive and thorough knowledge.

Among the characteristics of his mind as a lawyer, were sound judgment, acuteness, quickness and correctness of apprehension, fairness, and independence. These, combined with that enthusiastic love of the law, and standing upon the firm basis of that extensive and profound learning just spoken of,

could not fail to give him early a high rank in a most honorable and difficult profession. We have never seen a man, who appeared to surmount the difficulties of that profession with more ease, or bear its honors, and discharge the duties of one of its first offices, with more simplicity, more commanding yet unpretending dignity, obvious yet unconscious superiority. In his decisions he was cautious, but prompt; always open to conviction from any quarter, weighing impartially all circumstances, having a kind regard to all worthy feelings, quick to discern between right and wrong, indignant at any attempt to pervert justice or swerve in the least from truth, and fearless in awarding to virtue its merited reward, to vice its just punishment. None could observe him in public or private life, and not see the high moral principles which governed and ennobled his whole conduct, conferring an elevation, inspiring a confidence, and imparting blessings, which no mere power or talents could ever bestow.

It need not be said, that the man who possessed these qualities, was eminently fitted to be a *teacher* of the science to which he devoted himself. This office he always seemed desirous of assuming, from a willingness and desire to impart to others all the light and knowledge he had been able to acquire himself. In no part of his duty did he take more delight; and in none was he more acceptable or successful. To this, all who have had the benefit of his instructions, bear eager, full, delighted testimony. His urbane dignity, his easy familiarity, his readiness as well as power to communicate his knowledge, his inexhaustible fund of pleasant practical illustration, the amenity and kindness of his manners at all times—these are spoken of with a more than common degree of affection and enthusiasm, warm gratitude, and now unmingled sorrow.

But it is not possible to point out separately the traits of this character, nor is it necessary. Indeed, it is not right. For its excellence and beauty did not lie in separate features, but in the united whole. It cannot be said, perhaps, to have been uncommon in any one respect, so much as in all combined. There was a rare cultivation of every power, an unusual faithfulness to every talent, opportunity, and trust, an admirable adjustment of powers, a balance and completeness of character, which we may not expect to see often. This character was formed under no peculiar advantages; indeed, with the great disadvantages of an imperfect education and a feeble constitution. But it gave him an early distinction, allowed by all to be merited. It placed him in a sphere, in which his powers were

largely exercised, and their influence widely felt. Few have had more to contend with, yet very few, none have been more punctual, resolute, laborious, faithful to every duty. Most truly, in this respect, most emphatically may it be said of him, that he lived not to himself; for his strength was again and again exhausted in the service of others. How often have we seen him prostrated by great exertion, yet returning, with an aching head and powers almost spent, to the scene of duty, and devoting himself to its performance with the same ardor and unrelaxing diligence. No indisposition, no love of ease, no attachment to domestic scenes, dear as they were, no personal considerations of any kind, made him deaf to the call of duty.

But he was not a professional man only. There was nothing confined or illiberal in his pursuits. He was a general scholar. He kept pace with the progress of the age in almost every department; particularly, making himself thoroughly acquainted, whatever effort it might cost, with any branch of science or philosophy, which would aid, in any way, the discharge of his duties. He seemed ever on the watch to note the changes, the advances, the ever varying circumstances and character of society, with the wish to adapt himself to its changes, to meet its wants, to promote its progress, to direct his professional and other influence, all his energy to the one noble purpose of social, intellectual, moral improvement in those around him.

To do this, to make himself familiar with the literature of the day, and all that should engage the attention of a member of society, and at the same time to maintain a high standing in his own laborious calling, he knew would require great *industry*. And this is a part of his character, or more properly of his conduct, which should not be passed over. To his industry he owed everything. It was the groundwork and whole explanation of his character and usefulness. It began with his earliest habits, and continued while strength remained. Unusual method in the arrangement, and frugality and assiduity in the use of his time, were features so prominent that the most heedless observer could not have overlooked them. Many proofs might be given; some of them not common. It is well known, that he seldom, if ever, travelled without a book as his companion, when no better companion was at hand; nor did he ever ride far, without making himself master of the contents of a volume. A portion, even of that time which his feeble health required him to give to recreation and to pass in places of public resort, was regularly set apart and conscientiously devoted to reading.

Indeed, nearly all his general reading, which was by no means restricted or superficial, was done at such times, and in the short intervals of business at court. He had also the habit, formed early and always continued, of reading to his family, whenever it could be done; and he ascribed to it much of the happiness of his life. There was a fixed habit of turning, if practicable, every hour and every opportunity to some good account. There seemed to rest upon his mind continually a sense of the immense value of time; a conviction that the use or abuse of it involved lasting consequences to the individual and to society, and that there was with every man an obligation, high and sacred, to devote his time, not to himself, not to trifling pursuits, but to others, to the community.

Of this trait we love to speak. Generally, we know, industry is not ranked with the virtues; certainly not with the great virtues. It seldom attracts attention or commands admiration. It is often passed by in neglect, and sometimes sneered at as not of christian stamp, nor of much value. To us it does not wear this doubtful character. We are disposed to give it a high place on the scale of moral worth. In our view, as in the apostle's, to be 'diligent in business,' is closely connected with being 'fervent in spirit,' and 'serving the Lord.' Assuredly, if he who aims to keep his powers in constant exercise, to fill his time, to double the talents entrusted to him, is to be regarded as in any measure a Christian, then is industry a virtue. If to live for others, and to strive to promote the welfare of those around us, is one of the purposes of our existence, and one of the conditions of the divine approbation, then is industry of great moral value. Without this, how can a man be regarded as a religious man? To this, how much private and public happiness may be ascribed. In our community especially, how many men do we see in our highest and most responsible places, raised there by this quality alone; and how much more are such men to be honored, than those on whom wealth, or any adventitious circumstances, have conferred distinction. The former are the true benefactors. Than a man of industry, though this be his only talent, and his sphere very humble, society can hardly have a more useful member, a greater ornament or blessing.

There is another virtue of a similar character, for which he was distinguished; *economy* in the midst of liberality. In regard to this also, there are great mistakes. He usually is considered the most liberal, the most benevolent and generous man, who expends most for the entertainment of friends, or gives most in public charities, even though his family and those who

entirely depend upon him, are sufferers by it. Very differently does it appear to us. We regard that as the true generosity and benevolence, which makes its ability the measure of its exertion, consulting first the wants of those who have the first claim, and then doing all for others that it possibly can, doing it for the good of others, and not for its own display or credit, showing to the world, that liberality, active and large benevolence, is perfectly consistent with frugality, and that the latter is as noble and useful a virtue as the former. For a liberality like this, the man to whom we refer was distinguished. In hospitality, in humanity, for the support and spread of learning and religion, no man was more ready than he, to do all that he could, in justice to the many who depended wholly on his daily exertions. But he would not do more. He would never infringe the rights, or sacrifice the comfort of these, for the sake of a name or praise. He believed, and feared not to act upon the belief, that there was a truer benevolence, a greater and far more useful generosity; that society at large, mankind would be more benefited, by a frugal, quiet, and consistent liberality.

The value to the community of such a character is immense. We can never calculate it. We never know it, until it is withdrawn, until we feel its loss, and see the dreadful chasm that is left, and hear the voice of lamentation, and the mingling of sorrow, that pass through the land. And when has this testimony been given, in a more full and unequivocal manner than now, to the public worth of the man whose character we are attempting to delineate? He was universally known, and it is believed there are few, even among those who knew him only as a public minister, who have not some feeling of personal loss in his death. His powers and station enabled him to do much for all, and he aimed to be faithful to his ability. He seemed to be deeply impressed with the responsibility that rested upon him, and fearful often, I think I may say always very fearful, that he should not in all respects be equal to that responsibility. This feeling prompted him to great exertion. It made him regardless, too regardless, of his own strength, and thoughtful only of the service he could render. He was a benevolent man in the best sense; not confining his benevolence to good wishes, common sympathy, or loud professions; much less keeping it ostentatiously in sight as a claim upon the public notice and admiration. He was as far from everything of this kind as any man that ever lived. It was his utter abhorrence, and we believe he would rather have forfeited all reputation for benevolence, than have made any display of it. They who knew him at all, will bear

witness to his unassuming character, in every relation and exertion. Yet, we repeat, he was a benevolent man in the best sense. There were in his life many acts of private beneficence—of that silent, unobtrusive charity, whose disinterestedness admits not of a moment's doubt. But these should be left to the silence which they loved. We appeal now to his life; a whole life devoted, may we not say, sacrificed, to the public service. We appeal to those many relations, domestic, public, civil, and religious, which he filled, and filled so well. But the appeal need not be made; for our community strongly expressed their sense of his worth, before and after that event which deprived them of so valuable a member.

Of his public life, but one remark further need be made; and this applies to his whole life. To whatever eminence he rose, or whatever influence he acquired, it was attained entirely by a uniform, unpretending, consistent course—by the power of character; and this adds another to the proofs, so honorable to our country, that integrity and industry are the surest passports to distinction and the confidence of all.

Of the *private* character of Judge Howe, we would next speak; his fidelity to the domestic relations. But to this, we can only allude. For they who often saw him there, they especially who leaned upon him there, have too painful a sense of his worth, to permit his private virtues to be drawn from their sanctuary, and exposed to the public gaze. We may however be permitted to say—our feelings will not permit us to say less—that as a son, a relation which he sústained until within two years of his death, and which made in some respects peculiar demands upon his fidelity—as a brother, a husband, father, friend, he exhibited a purity and strength of affection, and inspired a degree of interest, an ardor of attachment, a feeling of dependence, and now of loss, such as we have seldom known. Bitter indeed are the tears that have gushed from the hearts of the bereaved. And nothing, nothing but that consolation which is stronger than life or death, which earth has no power either to give or take away, is sufficient to assuage their grief.

But one trait remains; and this we are hardly willing to present as a distinct trait, for it entered into every part of his character, and its full excellence can be known only by observing it in connexion with other features. Nor is it with entire freedom that we speak of this trait; for, strong as is our own conviction of its power and value, we know that he to whom it belonged would have been more than unwilling that it should ever

be made the subject of public remark. Yet there is a sense in which the public now have a right to know this part of his character. Moreover it is this on which we most delight to dwell; it is this which gives most, which gives all the comfort to the afflicted; it is this which imparts to his whole character a beauty and grandeur, that nothing else could. You know, reader, to what I refer. For you know there is nothing in this world that confers an elevation and dignity to be compared with that which religion confers. This elevation and dignity were his. He whom we mourn was a *religious* man. He was truly and eminently a Christian.

In asserting this thus strongly and very emphatically, without qualification or reserve, we feel that we are taking upon ourselves great responsibility. But we are willing to meet it. For beside that we have had opportunities of knowledge, such as are not given to every one, we make our appeal to that of which every one may judge; to the life, to those fruits by which alone men are to be surely known. According to any other standard, certainly according to that of a sound faith, in the popular acceptation of those words, we could not claim for him the name of Christian. For he did not belong to the dominant party. Indeed he belonged to no party. It were a great wrong to call him, in any narrow sense, a party man. What his religious opinions were, every one knew, for he never concealed them. He held them most firmly. For their quiet enjoyment and wider spread, he incurred many reproaches, and made sacrifices; and he was always ready to avow, and, in every proper way, to advance and defend them. This in fact was a natural consequence of the manner in which his opinions had been formed. He had taken them, not from education, and early, unconscious habit, for these had given a different direction; not from man's teaching, for this he regarded as of no authority or value in comparison with the teaching of the Son of God; not from ambition, a desire of popularity and ease—this least of all, for then he would hardly have encountered, as he did, the power of fashion, the violence of prejudice, the opposition and clamor of the multitude. No. He had taken his opinions and imbibed his spirit at the uncorrupted fountains of truth, and at the footstool of that Being with whom he held habitual communion.

He had been educated in the Calvinistic faith; and though he seems never to have been a bigot to that or any faith, he reached mature life in the full persuasion that this was the religion of the bible, nor could he regard without fearful solicitude, those who had embraced a different system. It was not

until after he had entered upon his profession and removed to Worthington, that he was led, by some peculiar circumstances, to examine the foundations of his religion. This he did patiently and thoroughly, giving the whole subject a long and deliberate investigation, reading much on both sides, bending his highest powers to the task, and seeking continually, anxiously, divine light and guidance. He took nothing upon trust. He cared not for human authority. He feared not human judgment, nor shrunk from the suspicion or sacrifice to which the adoption of an unpopular faith might subject him. Truth was his only aim. The bible was his only guide. And the faculties which God had given him, and the aid he had promised, were the only means by which he sought to learn what God had spoken and what he required. The result is well known. The force of education and first impressions, yielded to the power of uncorrupted truth and the convictions of an unshackled mind. He became a decided, firm, serious Unitarian. More than this, his faith in Christianity as a divine system, became more clear, rational, settled, and delightful. Never, it is said without fear of contradiction, never has any man risen from the study of the sacred volume, with a higher reverence for its divine authority, or a firmer conviction that its truths are all worthy of entire confidence, affection, and obedience. These convictions and feelings attended him to the latest hour, and became stronger with every trial of their strength. More than once have we heard him speak of the clearness and power with which the evidences of Christianity affected his mind; and that, not as a religion to be believed merely, but cordially embraced, studied seriously and habitually, and made the governing rule of life, and the foundation of all hope. More than once has he given it as his opinion, as well as the declaration of some of the most eminent men who have adorned his profession, that if the testimony to the truth of the gospel, the evidence on which the supernatural character of Christ and his religion rests, should be brought into any court, and subjected to any earthly tribunal, it must be admitted as entirely conclusive, or all common acknowledged principles of evidence must be abandoned.

To us it is everything to hear such a man speak thus on such a subject. There is no evading nor adding to the force of such a decision, as regards our religion itself or the character of the man. From every fair mind it must go far to dissipate all doubt, and rebuke all coldness and indifference. It is better, more convincing and valuable, than any testimony from the appointed ministers of religion; for in them it is always considered

by the world as in some degree at least a matter of course, of profession, or policy. Besides, when we give ourselves up entirely to one study, there is danger that our minds may be narrowed, and that arguments and principles which we see chiefly in one connexion, may assume in our eyes a character or force that does not belong to them. But when we see a man of a different profession, having the most favorable opportunities for observing human nature and weighing testimony in every connexion and form, bringing high powers, a clear, unbiassed judgment, to the examination of this question, and reasoning upon it with as much coolness, deliberation, and impartiality, as upon any question of law or equity, we feel that his decision is entitled to confidence; we feel our own faith confirmed and invigorated by it; and if we see its good fruits, its sincerity and influence in the life of him who exhibits it, it gathers an importance which can hardly be overrated.

And this is the great value of the testimony before us. It is not that this individual was better able to judge of the truth of Christianity, or a firmer believer than many others; for we know and rejoice that many of the leading men of his profession have been, and are, equally firm, and hold the same rational and serious views of truth. But we attach an especial value to this testimony, because it was remarkably consistent throughout. In public and private, as a citizen, a lawyer, and a judge, in his domestic and social walks, at the family altar and in the temple, in sickness and health, in life and death, this man was the same; conscientious, unpretending, candid, upright, faithful, firm. No eye but one of prejudice or malignity, could discover in him anything inconsistent with strict moral principle. It is saying much, but no more than the truth, that they who have known him best, who have been admitted most freely to the secrets of his breast, and to that sanctuary where there can be no effectual disguise or equivocation, have thought most highly of the purity of his character, the strength of his principles, and the benevolence of his heart. Oh! it is beyond the power of man, of the opposing world, to move their faith in his integrity and inestimable worth. They cannot, indeed, point to any one act, any loud professions, any emblazoned charities, or popular opinions; for they know that for his opinions he was cast out from christian fellowship, and the table of his Lord was barred against him. But they could point to many unnoticed acts; to consistent, uniform good conduct; to unvarying kindness and charity, the more disinterested and real, because unpretending; to opinions held in despite of reproach, at no little sacrifice, and

with the firmest adherence to conscience and duty. They do point to a uniform, laborious, irreproachable life; short, but filled with service, and useful beyond the common measure; harrassed by continual sickness and often by severe suffering, yet devoted, without a murmur and without cessation, to the highest interests of the public, to the purest delights of family and friends, to the cultivation of the best powers, to the promotion of truth, virtue, and happiness.

Who will compare such a life, such a religion with one of mere opinions, professions, or forms? Who will compare its purity, its benevolence, its disinterestedness, its conformity to the christian standard, with a religion, whose energies are locked up in the breast, or wasted upon the tongue, or devoted only to those of a particular name or creed, dispensing no real blessing to the community? If any would do this, let him look at the life of Jesus, and stand rebuked. It is a noble sentiment—and we rejoice to express it in the dying words of him whose memory we so fondly cherish—that the exact measure of our happiness, is the degree in which we make others happy. We may add, this is the measure of our religion too, if the happiness we impart to others, is that which God would confer, the happiness of virtue. To seek to promote this, in ourselves and around us, is to be a Christian.

And this we believe, this we know, to have been the constant aim of the man we mourn; the language of his life, no less than of his death. Religion with him was a deep principle, having its seat within, not without, and putting forth its power in actions rather than words. If it did not, like a distinct imposing feature, or an occasional garment, force itself upon your attention, it was because it was always worn, or incorporated with the whole man, and its influence equally diffused throughout the character and life. It governed the temper, it subdued the passions, it chastened the conversation, it purified and warmed the heart, it ennobled the mind, it elevated the affections above sordid and debasing pursuits, it prompted to a life of active, selfdenying, unwearied usefulness. It led him to take a sober view of life; of life in all its relations, its duties, opportunities, powers, destiny. It led him to speak and act with great deliberation, looking to the consequences of conduct upon others and himself, upon the present and the future, in this world and through eternity. It kept continually before him his own weakness and liableness to err, and made him charitable to the weakness and errors of others, cautious in judgment, sparing of condemnation, yet always open and resolute in discriminating between

right and wrong, both in opinion and practice, eager to extol and exalt the one, decided and fearless in condemning the other. It carried his views and aim far beyond the narrow contemptible bounds of party and a name. It told him he was to live to mankind, and not to a favored few; that God and Jesus, and no earthly master had sent him into the vineyard, and that in imitation of their example, he should open the arms of affection, and send out good influences, to all. In short, his religion made him feel deeply and fearfully the burden of responsibleness that rested upon him, and upon every member of society, every intelligent, accountable, immortal being; a responsibleness extending to every talent, every faculty, every hour, and reaching in its solemn consequences through uncounted and countless ages. To discharge this responsibleness, in all its vastness and sacredness, was his single aim. That he effected it, we do not say. We are content to say, as he did in the final review, 'Thou, God, knowest.'

Such, in our view, was the religion of Judge Howe, and such its influence on his life. We are aware that the picture may to some seem extravagant—some who knew him not, or saw him only through an unfavorable medium. Of those who knew him well, and saw him as he really was, there need be no fear. I am persuaded that there dwelt upon his mind, a conviction, more than usually strong, habitual, and operative, of his dependence and accountableness. It was to be seen in his discharge of public duty, in his conversation, and particularly in his private correspondence. His letters to his family, especially those to his children, and I hope I do not violate confidence in speaking of them, are filled with evidences of a serious, devout spirit, expressions of the most affectionate, anxious interest in the temporal, and much more in the spiritual welfare of those depending upon him, and earnest exhortations to diligence, sobriety, prayer, and all christian virtue. He seems ever to feel, and strives to inspire the feeling, that we are sent into the world for something more than our own indulgence or amusement; that we have higher connexions than those which come and go with a breath; that we came from God, and should live to God. This feeling was not occasional, nor ever wild; but, calm and habitual, like his religion itself, it was not a passion, but a principle. It brought God very near to him. The thought of his presence, his perfections, his will, was associated with all that surrounded him; with the appearances of nature, no less than with the truths of revelation. In one of his letters, written just after beholding some of the grandest scenes which

our country presents, he thus speaks of their effect;—'The view of such scenes always seems to draw me nearer to my God. In the contemplation of his beautiful works, I feel more strongly impressed with a sense of his benevolence, and am ashamed that I should ever be unwilling to resign myself, without reserve, into his almighty hand.'

And was he unwilling, when the hour came? Did the religion, which guided, strengthened, and cheered him through life, forsake him in death? Did the views for which he had borne suspicion and reproach, for his conscientious adherence to which he had been forbidden to approach the table of a common Lord, or even to dedicate his children to Him who gave them, the views to which he had been brought by his own fearless and devout examination of the volume of truth, and in which he had found support and satisfaction, light and blessing in all his course of duty, toil, and suffering—did these views tremble and fail as the great conflict came near? It could not be. It was not. That same faith ministered abundantly, gloriously, to his support and joy in the hour of bitter trial. Fail? No. It became stronger as nature drooped. It brightened as the darkness gathered. Then was its glory and its full triumph. It pointed the dying believer through the breaking clouds, up to the unfading light which had always cheered him, and the rock on which he had securely rested. He met that messenger, to whom we are all perhaps too apt to give the name and character of a king of terror and awful gloom—he met him as a friend; taking him away indeed from friends dear to his heart, from scenes that he loved, from cares that he would willingly bear, and duties that he would gladly perform longer, but calling him to higher duties, to holier scenes, to many friends who had gone before, and to the surest, best friend of all. He departed full of this hope, strong in this faith; exhibiting to those around him its reality, its sustaining power, the delightful confidence it inspired, the heavenly serenity it imparted, the unearthly strength it gave, the glorious triumph it achieved, the pure, unclouded light which it caused to burst upon the parting soul. Of such a death, we love to think and speak. For there seems to us to go out from it a voice, strong and eloquent as Heaven's own truth, pleading for religion, for confidence in God, fidelity to Jesus, benevolence to man; yes, pleading, as with an angel's tongue, for humanity, truth, virtue, and the hope of a blessed immortality.

Yet of this, we fear to speak freely; for we know how lamentably such things have been abused. We feel, too, that there is in truth a sacredness in a death bed scene, which should never

be profaned. There are thoughts, moreover, awakened by the recollection of him who thus died, of what he was, and of the instinctive delicacy with which he would have shrunk from any display of the solemn realities of death, which restrain us from a full expression of our feelings, or at least warn us to offer nothing more than a sober, exact statement of what actually was. This we do for our own consolation, and in the belief, that, viewed in connexion with his life, its testimony to the power of religion, and the worth of such views of religion as he entertained, is of great value, and should not be withheld.

From the first violent attack of disease he discovered entire resignation to that event which he saw approaching, and the nearer it approached, the more perfect was his serenity, and the stronger his faith. Indeed its approach at this time was not, we believe, wholly unexpected. A few weeks before, he had expressed to a friend his belief that the December term of the court would finish his career. Although the premonition was not particularly regarded then, he himself remembered and referred to it the last night of his life. For about twelve days before his death, he was deprived of the power of utterance, and appeared in a great measure unconscious of what was passing. It was feared that he would leave the world in this silence and darkness; but, through the goodness of the God in whom he trusted, there was something better in reserve for him and his friends. The clouds that came up as if to obscure his declining sun, were to be dispersed, and the setting of that orb to be more glorious than its rising or meridian splendor.

On the evening of the last day, a near friend entered his chamber, expecting only to witness his silent departure. At the same time his son arrived from a distant town. Their well known faces seemed to recall the dying man to a sense of his whole situation. Affectionately he took the offered hand, enquired after the health of those who had been left, and said he believed it was nearly over with him. After speaking of his previous weakness and distraction of thought, he expressed a wish that he might be permitted to do the little that remained for him to do in this world. He prayed for strength. It was granted; and in the power of it, he addressed those who were about him, clearly and most impressively. He spoke first of the blessings that surrounded him in his sickness, and seemed particularly grateful to God and to his earthly friends, that, though away from home, every attention and kindness had been shown him. He then gave all needed directions as to his worldly affairs. Having done this, and dismissed the world from his

mind forever, he expressed warmly and emphatically his entire confidence, his gratitude, his affectionate interest in those most near to him, in all his friends, and commended them to God. From them his thoughts turned more particularly upon himself, his past life and present prospects. He said he had always felt that high trusts were committed to him, and that his was a solemn responsibleness. He had endeavoured to meet and faithfully discharge all his duties; and had been astonished often at the degree of light and satisfaction which were afforded him, as from above. His trust was in the mercy of God for the acceptance of his humble efforts, and the pardon of his remissness and sin. To God he appealed; and, as he spoke of his trust in him, of his firm faith in the religion of his Son, of the support he had derived from this religion through life, and its increasing power as life drew nearer its close, its power over all terrors of death and the dissolution of nature—there was a collectedness, a strength, an ardor, an eloquence, a sublime uplifting of the spirit far, far above the changing and passing objects of earth, which turned that chamber of death into a temple of calm and holy triumph. All tears were dried. The spirit of heaviness became indeed a garment of praise; the voice of weeping went up in the silent offering of gratitude and joy; every spirit was lifted with his who led the way, until they were rapt into the pure and full light of the world he was entering. That spirit in very truth is putting on its vestments of light, and returning to its native skies. 'It is, as it were, balancing its wings for its heavenward flight, to fold them not, till it shall bow before the throne of God!'

And when we see such a life closed and crowned by such a death, so entirely consistent, so delightfully consoling, we would not, we cannot conceal our satisfaction and gratitude. When we see a spirit like this thus awaking from the torpor of disease, praying earnestly for strength that it may spend its last breath here for the peace and virtue of those it had loved, then pouring itself out in strains of mighty eloquence for religion's cause, fervent yet collected, glowing yet rational, with repeated petitions for strength and direction, leaving its solemn testimony—a testimony which life had borne, and on which death was now setting its seal—to the strength and victory of faith, to the power of that truth which came in no sudden flash, but had long guided and sustained—and at last soaring away in serenity and triumph on the wings of Jesus' own prayer—when we see this, we must express the joy that it imparts; for it is consoling above all things else; it is rich in consolation, it is strong in assurance, it

is full of hope, sublime, immortal hope. We mention it not as a proof of doctrine; we vaunt it not to the world as a cause of sectarian triumph. Never. It is the triumph of religion, not of a sect. It is the power of principle, the strength of faith, the reality and glory of virtue, that we would exhibit. It is the full, clear, unsolicited, unequivocal, irresistible proof, that Christianity is not a fable, nor the peace it gives a mockery, nor immortality a dream. Many have died thus, we trust, of every name. We thank God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that it is so; and most fervently do we pray, that others may find the consolation that is given us. For now, in the recollection of this life and this death—and may they never be separated!—our murmurs are hushed, and gratitude mingles largely with the reverence in which we bow to the inscrutable decree. We feel that God has been good in giving and in taking away. We feel that much has been done for religion, for us, for all. We feel, in a word, that to die thus, is to live forever, receiving and dispensing blessing. It is not death, it is birth; the birth of the soul into its own bright and happy sphere. It is not the last, but the first hour of life and liberty. It is the dawn of immortality. The darkness of earth rolls away. The light of heaven breaks in upon the departing spirit, and the everlasting arms bear it home.

H.

HEAVEN.

The earth, all light and loveliness, in summer's golden hours,
Smiles, in her bridal vesture clad, and crowned with festal flowers,
So radiantly beautiful, so like to heaven above,
We scarce can deem more fair that world of perfect bliss and love.

Is this a shadow faint and dim, of that which is to come?
What shall the unveiled glories be, of our celestial home,
Where waves the glorious tree of life, where streams of bliss gush free,
And all is glowing in the light of immortality!

To see again the home of youth, when weary years have past,
Serenely bright, as when we turned and looked upon it last;
To hear the voice of love, to meet the rapturous embrace,
To gaze through tears of gladness, on each dear familiar face—

Oh ! this indeed is joy, though here, we meet again to part.
But what transporting bliss awaits the pure and faithful heart,
Where it shall find the loved and lost, those who have gone before,
Where every tear is wiped away, where partings come no more!

When on Devotion's seraph wings, the spirit soars above,
And feels thy presence, Father! Friend! God of Eternal love!
Joys of the Earth! ye fade away before that living ray,
Which gives to the rapt soul a glimpse of pure and perfect day—

A gleam of heaven's own light—though now its brightness scarce appears,
Through the dim shadows, which are spread around this vale of tears;
But thine unclouded smile, O God! fills that all glorious place,
Where we shall know as we are known, and see thee face to face!

A.

THE RITE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER A SYMBOLICAL LANGUAGE.

Till men arrive at a certain point in the progress of the mind, mysteries are, perhaps, necessary in religion. Beyond this point, nothing can be more injurious than mysteries. Up to this point, that is to say, while men are in a barbarous, or partially enlightened condition, reason is not sufficiently developed, and is not strong enough, to be the guide and controller of men's actions. The aid of imagination is needed; perhaps it would not be too much to say that superstition is needed. Beyond the point in question, when men are enough enlightened to be spiritually, rationally, heartily interested in religion, mysteries are hostile to these characters of religious sentiment. They tend to make religion unreal and mechanical, or else to make men skeptical and distrustful about it. The mind demands to be satisfied on other subjects, and if it is turned away with unintelligible dogmas and ordinances in religion, it will be liable to relapse into indifference or infidelity. It may be laid down as a general principle, indeed, that the mind cannot be truly interested in what it does not understand. It may be interested *about* it; it may have the most eager curiosity and desire to comprehend the mystery; but this is not the rational and hearty interest in religion which may be expected of an improv-

ed age. Not, however, that any man can expect to understand everything in religion, everything concerning God, and futurity; but, in order to be rationally interested, he must comprehend something; and he cannot be rationally and truly interested in that part which he does not comprehend.

With these views I think it the duty of a religious teacher, among an intelligent people, to carry explanation as far as he is able. And, on this account, I propose to offer a few observations on *the distinctive character and peculiar import of the Lord's supper*. This, together with the general design of our Saviour's death, probably, remains in deeper mystery to most persons, than any other part of the christian ritual or doctrine.

In the first place, then, the rite of the Lord's supper is a language; it is a symbolical language, and nothing else. It is simply and only a means of conveying certain ideas to the mind, and of awakening correspondent emotions in the heart. It is a '*showing forth* of the Lord's death.' 'This,' says our Saviour, 'this is, this *represents* my body broken for you; this represents my blood shed for you.' That is to say, these symbols are a showing forth, an emblematic communication of these facts.

I know that it is common to say in general, that the communion service is significant of the death of Christ. But I must desire the reader to enter into some more careful discrimination of this assertion.——There are several kinds of language, or modes of expressing ideas. There is the expression of the countenance and gesture; there are words, arbitrary or conventional signs of thought; there are words taken in their simple sense; and again there is a figurative language, the language of comparisons, analogies, images; and in fine there is the language of symbols or emblems. This last, I have said, is the mode of communication adopted in the rite of the Lord's supper. It is a language, I repeat. It is no more mysterious than any other language. It is, in itself considered, no more solemn; that is, unless it be for conveying more solemn thoughts.

But again, I say, that it does not convey more solemn thoughts, than those words which declare the passion, the patience, the meekness, and compassion of Jesus Christ. There is therefore no more reason, in the mode of communication, why we should have a feeling of constraint, or awe, or mystery, or seriousness, when we partake of the communion, than when we recount, in ever so simple and ordinary terms, the history of our Saviour's crucifixion. So far as the instrument is considered, it is just as solemn to read in the evangelist, the account of our Saviour's

passion, as it is to show it forth in the service of the communion; I say, so far as the instrument of thought is by itself considered. Partaking of the communion is regarded in the light of a profession, I know, and in this view, it is more solemn. But it is not more solemn, regarded as a language, a showing forth of the Lord's death. That is to say, the bread and the wine, are no more solemn or mysterious things, than the words of the evangelical record, which declare the same matters of fact and faith. On the one hand, are emblems of thought; on the other, are signs of thought.

Whoever looks for more than this, in the rite of the Lord's supper, I cannot hesitate to say, approaches it superstitiously; for I desire any one to consider, what more there can be. Is there any secret virtue or efficacy in these emblems? Certainly not. Does the use of them constitute any man a Christian? Assuredly not. Does it tend to make any one a good man, or to procure for him the favor of God, but from the natural impression which it conveys of certain facts and truths to his mind? Still we must answer, no. A man might as well imagine that, by partaking of one of our civic feasts, he were made a good citizen; or by joining in the domestic festival of our Thanksgiving, he were inspired with the virtue of religious gratitude.

I say again, for I would fix this point, it is just as solemn, so far as the instrument of thought is concerned, to have the evangelical narrative of our Saviour's sufferings read to us, as to have it set forth in the Lord's supper. Why is it not? The words of the narrative convey certain facts and truths to us; the emblems convey no more. There are two kinds of communication, but the same subject matter. The vehicle of communication is not the great thing; but the truth, the subject, the meek example, the heavenly patience, the divine forgiveness, the love stronger than death, that is set forth. These are the great things, the affecting matters, that are placed before us. And yet, I am afraid, there are many who look upon these symbols, 'weak and beggarly elements' as they are, in comparison with the solemn and glorious truths that are hidden under them—who look upon these external symbols with the chief awe, and who, although they have the gospel in their hands, and may at any time read and meditate on the glorious example and patient suffering of Christ, never think it necessary to be so solemn, or so much affected as at the communion. Ah! the virtue is easy that is required to be in exercise but once a month, or during a few brief hours in the year. An easy thing it is, in these brief seasons, to lay up the merit, that shall last for days

and months to come—to say, 'I have professed; and I have partaken of the communion; and I am a Christian.' And mysteries always are easier to get along with than duties. And the tasks of superstition itself do not require such strenuous endeavours as the toils of virtue.

With the principle which has now been laid down, the simple principle that the rite of the Lord's Supper is a symbolical language, I wish to proceed a step further.

And I say, that as there is no mystery in this language, and should be no superstition in using it, or communicating with it, so should there be no superstitious or mystical notion of its *relative value*. As its meaning should not be mistaken, so neither should its power be overrated. Whatever force it may have had to the Oriental mind, to us, it is not so powerful as the language of words, as the living voice and countenance. It does not hold the same place in the christian system of means, as the written and preached word do, though our superstition may have exalted it to a higher. If we have exalted it higher, we have erroneously done so. We have no warrant from reason, or from the gospel, for conferring this distinction upon it. The language of the New Testament, is, not that men were to be saved by the power of the sacraments, but 'by the foolishness of preaching,' as the apostle modestly says. Preaching was the grand instrument ordained for the conversion of the world.

And it is reasonable to suppose, that man, the living instrument of divine power, the great agent on earth for the communication of divine truth, that man, with the ardent and glowing soul, which breaks forth in the words of exhortation, which flashes from the eye, which trembles on the lips, which speaks in the whole countenance—that man, embodied, intellectual, feeling, eloquent man, should have more power in the economy of the christian religion, than a collection of mere and simple, however solemn emblems.

And this, again, perfectly accords with experience. When the communion is administered, though the symbols are, indeed, affecting, yet they do, by no means, penetrate the heart so deeply as the fervent words of prayer and exhortation, that come from the heart of the minister at the altar. The symbols are solemn mementos, indeed—they bring solemn things to mind; but it is the mind that must be quickened and touched to feel that these things are solemn; and God and nature have ordained that the mind should be more powerfully addressed by language, by words that breathe out the soul, by this communion of heart with heart, than by any forms or emblems of things. This is

so true, that if the sacrament in question were celebrated in perfect silence, if there were nothing but this communion with symbols, I am certain it would become, compared with what it is now, a far less interesting service.

The position which I here maintain seems to me exceedingly clear and most evidently scriptural, and scarcely to need the earnestness of language with which I have urged it. That a man should be a more powerful instrument for conveying thought, than a symbol, would hardly seem to need to be formally stated. And let it be remembered that one is an appointed instrument as much as the other.

But although this position is so very evident, nothing is further from the views of the body of Christians. They have learnt from Popish abuses, to exalt the sacraments above every other form and instrument of religious power and sanctity. They imagine, that when the minister of religion goes from preaching the word, to the service of the communion, he goes from the less to the greater, from the more secular, to the more sacred. They imagine that he is then approaching what is most of all, solemn and awful. And I say that this is their superstition, a superstition which I am persuaded, did not exist in the earliest age, a superstition certainly unwarranted by our Saviour and his apostles. Visible symbols and rites at that period, were things of every day occurrence and use. Now they are uncommon. They are, therefore, strange to us; we do not easily communicate with them; and hence we are more liable to impressions of mystery and superstition.

And it is this superstition and this mystery that I would take away from the simple rite of the Lord's supper. I am persuaded, that they can do us no good. I know, both from experience and observation, that they do much hurt. This feeling of preternatural awe and mystery, makes the celebration of the Lord's supper, to many, a constrained and anxious service. I doubt not that there are multitudes who enter upon this service with pain and solicitude, and who feel relieved when it is concluded. What injury must a religious observance do, which is thus regarded!

I have been ready to ask, my reader, while I have been saying these things, Can you bear them? They are true; and why, then, should they not be declared to a community of intelligent Christians? They are true; and every man whose mind is at all disembarrassed from traditional prepossessions, must see that they are true. I call upon Christians to be no more children in these matters, but men. I ask them, not to think lightly of

the communion—far, far from it—but I ask them to think soberly as they ought to think. The simple and spiritual views which I present of this ordinance, will not tend, in the slightest degree, to abate a true reverence for it, nor a calm and religious seriousness in the celebration of it.

I can think of no kindred solemnity that is fitted to awaken so deep an emotion as this. If there were a civic feast ordained in remembrance of that great and good man to whom we look, and to whom the eyes of all coming generations in this land shall look back, as the Father of his Country, I doubt not that, in the celebration of it, thousands among us would be touched with a filial reverence for his virtues and gratitude for his services. There would be no mystery, no superstition, but a simple and deep homage to his memory.

What, then, does it become us to feel, when celebrating, not the political saviour of a country, but the moral Saviour of the world? The remembrance which we cherish in this service, is of a more exalted virtue, of a more disinterested benevolence, of a more heavenly piety and patience, of an example and a suffering tending to more holy ends and issues, than all the annals of the world besides can furnish. There is no being that has lived on the earth, that ever shed such light upon my path, or opened to me such fountains of consolation, or held up to me such a glorious hope, as Jesus my Saviour has done. The benefits, which he communicates, were purchased with toil and privation, were sanctified by sufferings, and sealed in blood; and they are blessings transcending all that the world can bestow—blessings, spiritual, divine, immortal. For these things, no rites or vows of remembrance can be too solemn; no homage too reverential, no gratitude too profound, and affectionate, and constant. As often then as we eat the bread and drink the cup, let us show forth, with all affection and humanity, the remembrance of Christ; and let us ever show forth the same remembrance by the imitation of his virtues! D.

REVIEW.

ART. VII.—1. *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, with Resolutions passed at a Public Meeting held November* 5, 1827. Boston, N. S. Simpkins & Co. 1827. 12mo. pp. 21.

2. *Discourses on Intemperance, preached in the Church in Brattle Square, Boston, April* 5, 1827, *the Day of Annual Fast, and April* 8, *the Lord's Day following.* By JOHN G. PALFREY, A. M. Pastor of the Church in Brattle Square. Second Edition. Bowles & Dearborn. Boston. 1827. 18mo. pp. 111.

3. *First Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance.* Andover. 1828. 8vo. pp. 68.

THE great exertions that have been made in this country to repress intemperance during the last few years, cannot have escaped the observation of any one who is interested in the movements of the community. The causes which have contributed to produce the alarming prevalence of this evil, have been investigated and pointed out with great precision. The corporeal and mental diseases, the destruction and desolation which have attended its progress, have been exhibited with the most affecting eloquence, and its remedies have been diligently sought for, and presented to the public in the most practical forms. Societies have been formed, public meetings held, addresses delivered, tracts and newspaper essays circulated, to call forth, if possible, the whole moral strength of the country, to aid the cause of virtue.

Of the many publications on this subject, those named at the head of our article are among the most valuable. Mr Palfrey has collected, with great care, the statistics of intemperance, and painted the ruin and misery, which it entails on its victims and society, in glowing colors. Some of the calculations which he has introduced,—as the number of deaths produced by it, the number of persons injuriously affected by its prevalence, the quantity of ardent spirits consumed in the United States, and the amount of property wasted by it,—must startle even those who would fain be incredulous as to the extent of this national calamity. He has also given many valuable suggestions as to the modes in which the cure of the evil is to be attempted.

The Report of the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, presents some of the causes of the general prevalence of this vice, and its remedies, in a more plain and tangible shape, than any publication we have seen. This Society has probably been the cause of much good by keeping the public mind continually awake to this subject. Its long continued and judicious exertions merit the highest gratitude of the community.

The Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, contains a great quantity of interesting matter, which deserves a wide circulation. The plan adopted by this society of having a secretary or general agent, to collect and publish information on the subject of intemperance, and to devote himself to promoting the cause of temperance, appears to us very judicious. We doubt not that this association is exerting a powerful and salutary influence on the public morals.

Though the subject is in a great degree worn and exhausted, and though we can hardly expect to arrive at any new conclusions concerning the causes, nature, and remedy of the disease, yet we believe it to be at all times useful to direct the public mind to it in every possible mode. As long as the evil continues to be alarming, the attention of the community ought not to be suffered to slumber, although little can be added to the weight of facts and arguments which have already been accumulated. What is now wanted, is not so much any new information, as to have what is already known widely diffused, and deeply impressed upon every individual.

It is gratifying to believe that the efforts which have been made to repress intemperance, have not been wholly in vain. It cannot, we think, be questioned, that the higher classes of society, in this part of the country, are more temperate than they were fifteen or twenty years ago. This has probably been occasioned, in a great degree, by the very prevalence of the vice, which has led educated and thinking men to beware of the first approaches of bad habits, and to inculcate on their children a salutary horror of their effects. They are evidently alarmed by the nature and extent of the evil which oppresses the country, and desirous of adopting any measures to diminish it. A change, too, has taken place in their opinions with regard to the use of distilled liquors. There are now fewer convivial meetings among these classes, and ardent spirits are in less common use. There is also reason to hope that a good impression has been made on the laboring classes; that many among them begin to find that spirits are not necessary as a stimulus to labor, but that they are

injurious, when taken habitually, even in moderate quantities. They are in consequence less used at times of labor, and less frequently offered as a mark of hospitality. In Boston the consumption of spirits has sensibly diminished within a few years, and the same is no doubt true of other parts of the country. The number of licenses in this place, which in 1822 amounted to 675, was in 1827 only 562, notwithstanding the great increase of population in the mean time. This is certainly a very encouraging result, and, though creditable to the government of the city, is chiefly to be ascribed to the change which has been taking place in public opinion. *

It may also be considered as an encouraging circumstance that societies have become common, throughout the country, of which the chief condition of membership is an entire abstinence from ardent spirits. Such associations must act powerfully on the morals, not only of the members themselves, but of all persons within the sphere of their example; and we hope to see them multiplied, particularly among the laboring classes, who are exposed to peculiar temptations from the present habits of society.

The causes of the excessive use of ardent spirits in the United States are well stated in the Report of the Massachusetts Society.

'It seems now to be generally admitted, by those who have had an opportunity for observation, or have made themselves acquainted with the various facts which have been collected with regard to intemperance, that we are to attribute much of the prevalence of *immoderate drinking*, to the erroneous opinions and practices of society with regard to *moderate drinking*. No man, probably, ever became at once a druhkard. Drunkards have all once been *moderate* drinkers, and have only gradually and insensibly become *immoderate* drinkers. It would seem, then, that there must be something wrong in this habit of moderate drinking, since it leads, in so large a proportion of cases, to so deplorable a result.

'What then is the origin of this custom of *moderate* drinking, which has prevailed so universally among the people of this country? Is it *merely* the cheapness of ardent spirits and the facility with which they may be obtained? These causes no doubt contribute most powerfully to convert moderate drinkers into drunkards; but not altogether to originate the custom of moderate drinking itself. Opium is a stimulus, to most persons very pleasant in its effects, not so dear as spirituous liquors, as easily obtained, and less injurious to health. Yet an opium eater is com-

* The following table shows the number of licenses granted in the city of Boston, during the last six years.

	1822	1823	1824	1825	1826	1827
Innholders	57	38	44	38	34	39
Victuallers	496	530	518	556	516	504
Retailers	113	103	65	43	17	17
Confectioners	9	8	3	5	5	2
	675	679	630	642	572	562

paratively rare, whilst the majority use spirits in some form and to some extent. If it be not the cheapness which has made the use of spirits on ordinary occasions so common, to what are we to attribute it? Principally, it is apprehended, to the opinion so generally entertained, that, when used in moderation, they are innocent or even salutary; that they are a necessary support during labor, and a protection against exposure to the inclemency of the weather and to bodily hardship of every kind. It is remarkable, to recur again to the illustration derived from opium, that those persons who have become persuaded that the moderate use of this drug is necessary to their health, their preservation from disease, or to the support of their sinking spirits, are liable to fall into its *excessive* use, exactly as *moderate* drinkers fall into the excessive use of ardent spirits. It is also to be remarked, that in those countries where opium is used as a stimulant, where it is as cheap, or cheaper than spirit with us, and as accessible to all classes of society, still opium eating does not become so common a vice, because the drug itself never ceases to be held in common opinion as a medicine or a poison.

'This tends to show that the real ultimate difficulty lies in the estimation in which spirits are held, and in the custom which prevails with regard to them. Could we be taught to look on distilled spirits in the same light that we look upon opium, or even that the Turk looks upon opium, it is obvious that it could no longer be an article of *common* use, and it would in consequence cease to be abused by intemperate indulgence.' pp. 5–6.

But it is not our present purpose to investigate the causes or nature of the disease under which our country is suffering, but merely to consider a few of the measures which have at different times been proposed to alleviate or remove it. Among these the diffusion of correct opinions, is among the most important, and is thus recommended in the Report from which we have just quoted.

'It may be assumed as true, for it is supported by the most abundant evidence, and by the almost unanimous opinion of those whose pursuits give them the opportunity of observing, and whose profession the power of judging, that ardent spirits are not necessary to any individual even when undergoing the most severe bodily labor, but that on the whole they have rather a tendency to enfeeble him and unfit him for his task; that they are not necessary to protect him from the consequences of exposure to wet, cold, wind, &c., but that, on the contrary, they render him more liable to be unfavorably affected by such exposure; that, so far from being salutary when used in moderation, they are not even innocent, and that no man habitually indulges even in their moderate use, who does not, at some period of his life, suffer from their ill effects on his health and constitution. Now, could these truths be firmly fixed in the minds of men; could they in particular be firmly impressed upon the mind of every young person, so that he should grow up with them, and enter into life with them, it would almost follow of course that the custom of moderate drinking would gradually cease, and that of immoderate drinking, as a natural consequence, cease also.

'The most distinct object, then, which presents itself to the minds of those engaged in the suppression and prevention of intemperance, is the dissemination of these opinions as widely as possible. If they are founded in truth, it can be made to appear so to the satisfaction of intelligent and respectable men, and gradually to the satisfaction of all. Not per-

haps in this generation, not perhaps in the next; for men seldom can be entirely divested of opinions and prejudices which they have acquired in their youth—but in the course of time it may be accomplished and will be accomplished.

'These opinions are to be impressed on society by addressing the various classes of which it is composed, in a manner and form adapted to their different education, modes and habits of life. Strong and convincing statements should be made, for instance, of all the facts which tend to show that ardent spirits are not necessary to men engaged in labor. This is a point which lies at the very commencement of the undertaking. It is very difficult to convince even very temperate men, who have been brought up from boyhood, to labor, supported by ardent spirits, that it is possible for any man to labor hard without them; or even if they become convinced that they are not originally necessary, they still cling to the belief, that habit has made them indispensable to them. Still a thorough impression can be made upon some and a partial one upon many. If men can only be convinced that their sons will be the better for not drinking, though they may continue to believe that they themselves still require it, it is something gained. This impression is to be made by the circulation of publications, in tracts, newspapers, periodical works, &c., setting forth in various ways the groundlessness of the common opinions on this subject; showing that ardent spirits can communicate no strength; that the excitement they produce is followed by a corresponding exhaustion; that other kinds of drink, although they exhilarate less, enable the body much better to bear fatigue; stating the most striking cases in which hard labor has been endured, and great hardships encountered by those who have used no spirits, much better than by those who have, and contrasting the character and health of those who drink, with that of those who do not.

'In connexion with statements of this kind, it should also be shown, that, while this practice is of no service to the laborer during his labor, it is, in the end, actually injurious to his health, by proving, as may be easily done, that *intemperance* in the use of ardent spirits is not necessary to their bad effects upon the health, spirits, and character; that the moderate drinker often brings upon himself disease and suffering, and falls a martyr to his habits; that no man can habitually use ardent spirits even in moderate quantities, without feeling sooner or later their sad effects, even though he may not be himself aware of the origin of those effects. The manner, also, in which ardent spirits produce such consequences might be dwelt upon; the symptoms by which the body is affected and disease indicated, detailed, and every man made to feel, in his own person, the consequences of indiscretion.' pp. 6–8.

It is in the power of the medical profession, more than any other class of men, to diffuse correct information with regard to the effects of the use of ardent spirits on the human frame. And, though the opinions of physicians on this subject have been long known, still we think that the votes which have lately been passed by several medical societies, to discourage the use of these liquors, will have a great influence in correcting popular prejudice and practice. *

The power of societies in spreading correct opinions is great,

* The votes of several medical societies may be found in the Annual Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance. pp. 38–40.

but the power of individuals is perhaps not less so. The most humble individual can always do something, by setting a good example. And those who have the direction of numbers of men and boys, as masters of vessels, superintendents of manufactories, and master mechanics, can do good to an extent which they would hardly believe without the experiment. This is very strikingly shown, in the letter of Mr Clowes, superintendent of the Rhode Island Coal Mines, which was published in our last number.

Much may be done to check intemperance by the mode in which children are educated. The good education, which all classes receive in this country, has no doubt a strong tendency to produce this effect. And though the moral character of individuals, is not always in direct proportion to their intellectual culture; still it may be safely affirmed that a general diffusion of knowledge is favorable to virtue, and that in our own country those classes which are the best educated, are on the whole the most moral. With regard to this particular vice, the best educated classes, though far from being exempt from it, are much less addicted to it, than those whose education is more imperfect. Extending information of any kind among the laboring classes, must promote habits of temperance. It gives their minds new views, and new employments; and thus the mechanics' institutions which are just beginning to be formed among us, will do much good, not merely by extending scientific information and promoting the progress of the arts, but by affording mechanics a delightful occupation for their leisure hours, and providing them with mental, in the place of sensual enjoyments.

But, although the diffusion of knowledge of any kind, will have a very beneficial tendency, yet much may be done by making temperance a specific object of attention in all places of instruction. The following remarks upon this topic, are from the Report from which we have already drawn so liberally.

'There can be no doubt that the common and free use of ardent spirits in families, by parents and their friends, in the presence of their children, and by children, with the sanction or at least without the absolute disapprobation of their parents, tends very much to keep up, and extend the habit of moderate drinking. The impressions and associations, which are thus formed with regard to the use of these articles, are in their nature peculiarly difficult to remove; and so far as they are concerned, we must trust chiefly to the influence which can be exercised through parents, and persons of adult age, who may become parents. Still there is room for the exercise of some direct influence upon the children themselves, through the books which are put into their hands, and the instruction they receive at school: Children are taught, in this way, that swearing, lying, and stealing, are criminal, and why may they not in the same way

be taught an early fear of the smallest indulgence in ardent spirits? It is true that this, like all their lessons of virtue, will be only too often counteracted by the examples which they witness at home; yet it is to be hoped that a strong favorable influence may be frequently exerted, and many saved by these early impressions from the dangers to which they are exposed.

'In no places of education would lessons of this kind have so beneficial an influence, and into none would they seem so properly introduced, as into Sunday Schools. Perhaps the object might be sufficiently answered by their introduction to these schools alone, since they embrace so large a proportion of the children of all classes, and more particularly of those which are most immediately exposed to temptations to intemperance. And it is again proper to remark, that the lessons which are to be thus inculcated, are not to be primarily directed against intemperance. There is absolutely and originally no temptation to this vice, as there is to lying, swearing, &c.; the complete, thoroughly formed vice, is held in contempt by all. It is against the friendly, convivial, social habit of drinking, and the habit of drinking for refreshment and support, that the young are to be warned, rather than against the crime of intemperance. They are to be regularly and systematically taught the principle that entire abstinence is the only course that is consistent with temperance, and with that moderation which is necessary to a sound body and a sound mind.' pp. 9–10.

We entirely coincide in these views. The strength and efficacy of early impressions, cannot be overrated. In the greater part of mankind they are the foundation of all their virtues. It is not to be supposed, that the child, when first told that he must not lie, and must not steal, feels very strongly the obligations of honesty and veracity. But the injunctions are again and again repeated; and, as he advances in years, an abhorrence of falsehood and dishonesty grows up with him, becomes the habit of his nature, and is, generally, far more powerful in regulating the conduct of the man, than any principles gained at a later period. In the same manner a love of temperance, and a horror of intemperance, if instilled in early youth, would be far more efficacious principles of conduct than if acquired in mature years. The virtues learned in advanced life, are too often like the frail and feeble blossoms which sometimes appear in autumn; if they do not fall in their very opening, their fruit perishes while it is yet green and immature.

We should be willing to go further than the Report. The laws of the Commonwealth now make it the duty of instructers of youth to impress on the minds of their pupils, a sacred regard to temperance. But we think it would be advisable to require by statute, that every public schoolmaster should make it a regular part of his duty, once in every week. The mode in which this instruction should be given, might very safely be left to the school committees, and schoolmasters. Though it would not be proper to legislate minutely on this subject, the course

which should be followed by schoolmasters is sufficiently obvious.

If the subject of temperance were thus to be made a regular part of the course of instruction in all our schools, it would tend to form in children, who have not the advantage of good instruction or example at home, that salutary aversion to ardent spirits which we now see in some persons whom nothing will induce to taste the smallest quantity. A great change in the character of the laboring classes might be effected by these means. Intemperance is the crying sin of our country. Against it we are directing all the powers of the pulpit and the press; and we should not neglect the still stronger power of early instruction. If, as has been asserted, we are a nation of drunkards, our character must be changed; and there is no power but education, which can produce the thorough reform which is required.

Another mode by which it has been proposed to diminish the use of ardent liquors, is to induce individuals to abandon the manufacture and sale of these poisons. Of late years the opinion seems to have been gradually gaining ground that the commerce in spirits is unjustifiable, and it has been stated as a fact, that 'merchants have already, in very considerable numbers, discontinued the sale of these articles, from conscientious motives.'* The moderate use of spirits, till within a short period, has been considered innocent by most people, and, by many, actually beneficial. But, it having been established by the concurrent voice of the medical profession that even the moderate use to persons in health, is not merely useless, but always dangerous, and generally pernicious, it seems difficult to resist the conclusion, however startling it may appear, that the traffic in spirits cannot be justified.

The common reply that we must not argue against the use of a thing merely from its abuse, will not serve in this case, where any use of the article, except as medicine, is injurious.

Though we may be well convinced of the sinfulness of this traffic, it does not by any means follow that those who are engaged in it are to be denounced. The distilling, vending, and importing of spirits have hitherto been considered reputable employments; and it is not to be expected that those engaged in them will, in a moment, be convinced of their impropriety. Being thus supported by their own and public opinion, it would not be either practicable or advisable for the national or state governments to take any measures to suppress these occupations.

* Annual Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance. p. 28.

Every man must judge of the lawfulness of engaging in them by the light of his own conscience. They cannot, we think, stand the test of the strict and searching morality of our religion. It is indeed hard to persuade a man to act against his present interest. But if the strict moralist is convinced that no use of spirits as an article of common drink, is justifiable, can he be satisfied that it is right to engage in preparing them or distributing them to the public for common use?

The only plausible argument by which any person can justify his aiding in preparing and distributing these destructive liquors to the public, is, that while the present taste for them continues, they will be distilled and sold, and that it makes no difference whether he does it, or some one else; that if he gives up his business, it will be merely sacrificing his profits for the benefit of his competitors, without doing any good to the public. We deny both the premises and the conclusion. It has always been thought a dangerous principle in morals to say, that a man may commit a crime, because the same evil would certainly result whether he had any agency in it or not. It is the same argument which Bonaparte used when he recommended poisoning the sick at Jaffa—the plague will certainly destroy them, therefore we may cut them off by opium. But it is needless to insist on the fallacy of a principle which no sound moralist will defend. Besides, we do not believe that no good would result from the voluntary abandonment of this business by persons engaged in it. There is no act so likely to produce a deep impression on the community, as the sacrifice of temporal interests from conscientious motives. It is a pledge of a man's sincerity which cannot be questioned, and gives the greatest weight to his opinions and example.

The striking analogy between this traffic and the slave trade, has been sometimes spoken of. Fifty years ago the slave trade was an important branch of English commerce. A large capital was employed in the business, and the buying and selling of human beings was sanctioned and encouraged by various acts of Parliament. During the preceding century a few unaided individuals here and there raised their voice against this nefarious traffic. But they seemed to speak to the winds; and at the period which we have mentioned, the greater part of the nation considered the attempt to abolish the slave trade as the height of insanity. A few years however elapse; the friends of humanity link themselves together; they exert themselves in Parliament. They are again and again defeated; but they rise from the ground with renewed vigor and confidence after every

overthrow, till at last the act for abolishing the slave trade is passed by an overwhelming majority. The man who should now attempt to sanction this traffic by law, would not obtain a hearing in the House of Commons. The course of public opinion on the same subject in our own country, has been similar. We mention the slave trade, because it affords a wonderful instance of the manner in which correct principles are gradually formed and fixed in the public mind, and because the arguments formerly used to justify it are very similar to those advanced in defence of the traffic in spirits. Thus, it is said that a great capital is invested in distilleries, in importing molasses and spirits, and that a great multitude of people are employed in raising grain for the distilleries. So in support of the slave trade, it was formerly urged that it employed a great number of men and a large capital. But the argument is fallacious. This capital and labor are engaged in preparing ruin and misery for the country. The great amount of capital, and the great number of persons employed in the business, do not at all change its character. If it would be unjust to hire an army of ten thousand men, who would otherwise be unemployed, to lay waste the territories of an unoffending nation, would it be more just to employ an army of a hundred thousand for the same purpose? Yet the cases are parallel; except that the injury done to the country by preparing and distributing spirits among the people, is beyond comparison greater than any which could be done by an invading army of a hundred thousand men, and there is no reason to believe that our whole nation might not be usefully employed, even if the use of spirits were entirely given up. If a person publishes a grossly licentious or irreligious book, he is subject to punishment as a criminal. Yet he might argue that he supported himself and several other persons by printing this book. Every one sees that this is no justification. And yet we think few would dare to say that the injury likely to arise to society from a free trade in immoral books, would be greater than that arising from the preparing and vending spirituous liquors.

It is often said, that nothing can be done by the laws to repress intemperance, that the remedy must be a moral one. But this is a very loose and incorrect assertion, and is no more true with regard to intemperance than many other objects of the law. It is true that unless the laws are aided by the moral force of the community they are vain and impotent. But to say that nothing can be done by law, is as idle as to assert that towers and walls are no protection to a city, because they require soldiers to man them. The moral force of the community is in-

deed required, in all its strength, to check this growing evil; but there is no mode in which it can act more effectually than in making good laws, and aiding in enforcing them.

If laws alone, however, could stay the progress of intemperance, it had long since ceased in Massachusetts. There is perhaps no vice which our fathers aimed so constantly to restrain. But the statutes having this object are so frequent, that we are led to fear that all their efforts were ineffectual; a conclusion fully supported by the present state of the country. It would be of little use to enumerate the great variety of provisions contained in these acts, as the legislation on this subject, under the colonial and provincial governments, was generally of a similar character to that which has been pursued by the Commonwealth, and the particulars in which their legislation differed from ours, are not of a character to be imitated in the present state of manners and opinions. Innkeepers and retailers were required to be licensed, and were punishable if they permitted excessive drinking in their houses, while individuals guilty of drunkenness were liable to be punished as criminals for every offence. The provincial statutes relating to licenses and licensed houses, with very slight modifications, are the same with those now in force in the Commonwealth; and the colonial statutes exhibit the rude outlines of the same system. The following specimens of our early legislation, will probably satisfy most of our readers.

'No person or persons, having license to keep a common house of entertainment, shall suffer any person, or persons, at unseasonable times, to drink or tipple in their houses, upon pain to forfeit for every time, for each person so tippling, five shillings; and it is declared to be unseasonable times any time after nine of the clock.' *

'If any person offend in drunkenness, excessive or long drinking, the second time, they shall pay double fines. And if they fall into the same offence the third time, they shall pay treble the fines, and if the parties be not able to pay the fines, then he that is found drunk, shall be punished with whipping to the number of ten stripes, and he that offends in excessive or long drinking, shall be put into the stocks for three hours, when the weather may not hazard his life or limbs.' †

A law of the Province, passed in 1693, provides that certain offenders, among whom drunkards are enumerated, if they are unable to pay the fines which are set on their offences, may be

* September 1646. Col. and Prov. Laws, Ed. 1814, p. 136.
† Col. and Prov. Laws, 137.

punished 'by setting in the stocks, or putting into the cage, not exceeding three hours, or imprisonment twentyfour hours, or by whipping not exceeding ten stripes, as the case may deserve.' *

As few persons who are not actively engaged in the administration of the laws, are acquainted with the great variety of statutes in Massachusetts, which have the repression of intemperance for their object, we have thought that it might not be uninteresting to present a sketch of the most important provisions of those which are now in force.

No person who is not licensed, can be a common victualler, innholder, or seller of wine, beer, ale, brandy, rum, or any strong liquors by retail, or in a less quantity than twentyeight gallons, under penalty of twenty pounds. And any person selling at any time, any spirituous liquors, or any mixed liquors, part of which is spirituous, without license therefor, forfeits for each offence, not more than six pounds, nor less than forty shillings. †

There are several sorts of licenses, such as the victualler's, the innholder's, and the retailer's. The innholder and victualler's licenses, give the right of selling spirituous liquors to be drunk in their houses. The retailer's license, only gives the right of selling spirits in small quantities, but he is prohibited from allowing them to be drunk in his shop, and if he allow them to be drunk in his shop, he is subject to the same penalties as if he sold without a license. ‡

All these licenses are obtained in the same manner. They are granted by the Court of Sessions on the application of the parties. But no license is originally granted to any person unless he obtains a certificate from the selectmen that he is a person of sober life and conversation, and suitably qualified for the business. All licenses must be renewed every year; and they are only renewed to those persons of whom the selectmen certify that they have maintained good rule and order in their respective houses and shops, and have conformed to the laws respecting licensed persons. §

The selectmen of each town are also required to certify to the Court of Sessions, every year previously to their term for granting licenses, which is the first court after the last Tuesday in June, the number of innholders and retailers in their respective towns which they judge to be necessary for the public good. ‖

* Col. and Prov. Laws, 259. † Mass. st. 1786, c. 68. s. 1.
‡ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 4. § Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 2.
‖ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 2.

And the Court of Sessions are directed by law not to license more persons in any town to keep public houses, or retail spirits than the justices shall judge necessary for the receiving and refreshing of travellers and strangers, and to serve the public occasions of each town, or necessary for the public good. *

Every person licensed as an innholder, victualler, or retailer, is required to pay for his license, besides the fees, a duty of four dollars. †

He is also obliged to become bound to the Commonwealth in twenty pounds, as principal, with two sureties in ten pounds each, for observing the laws which affect him as a licensed person. ‡

In Boston, the whole power of granting licenses is vested in the Mayor and Aldermen. In granting licenses, they are authorized to annex thereto such reasonable conditions in regard to time, place, and other circumstances, as, in their judgment, the peace, quiet, and good order of the city may require. The Mayor and Alderman have also a discretionary power to revoke or suspend any license. §

Every innholder, or victualler, is prohibited from suffering any person to drink to excess in his house, or suffering any minors, or servants, travellers excepted, to sit drinking, or to have any strong drink there, without special license from their respective parents, guardians, or masters, on penalty of twenty shillings. ‖

On a second breach of the act, he must, besides paying the penalty, recognise for his good behaviour for one year, with two sufficient sureties, and on a third breach forfeits his license, which cannot be renewed for three years. ¶

The selectmen in every town are required to have posted up in the houses and shops of all innholders and retailers within their town, a list of all reputed common drunkards or common tipplers, mispending their time and estate, in such houses. And every keeper of such house or shop, who, after such notice, is convicted of entertaining any of the persons named in such list, or permitting them to drink in his house, or selling them spirituous liquor, is liable to forfeit thirty shillings. **

Whenever any person, by idleness or excessive drinking, so wastes or lessens his estate, as to expose himself or his family to want, or the town to which he belongs to expense for maintaining him or his family, or shall indulge in spirituous liquors, so as to injure or endanger his health, the selectmen of the town are

* Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 15. † Mass. st. 1795, c. 80, s. 1. 1819, c. 131, s. 1.
‡ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 10. § Mass. st. 1821, c. 110, s. 13.
‖ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 7. ¶ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 8.
** Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 16.

required in writing under their hands to forbid all licensed persons in their town, and in any town to which he resorts, to sell him any strong liquor for one year. This prohibition is to to be renewed if he does not reform within the year. Any licensed person selling any strong liquor to such prohibited person is liable to a fine of twenty shillings. * And any person purchasing, procuring, or selling, or causing to be purchased, procured, or sold, any strong liquors for the use of such prohibited person, is liable to forfeit ten dollars. †

Any innholder, retailer, or victualler giving credit to any person inhabiting the town where he is trusted, or residing within five miles distance, for victuals and drink for more than ten shillings, is liable by statute to lose the whole amount so trusted, and all actions for such debts are barred. ‡

The law makes it the duty of tithingmen to inspect carefully all licensed houses, and to inform of all disorders or misdemeanours which they shall discover or know to be committed therein, as also of all such as sell spirituous liquors without license. §

Any innholder, victualler, or retailer, suffering any minor, tippler, or common drunkard, to remain in his house or store, or furnishing them with any strong liquor, is liable to a fine of ten dollars, and to forfeit his license, which is not to be renewed for three years. ‖

No victualler or innholder is allowed to entertain any persons, except travellers or lodgers, or suffer them to be on his premises drinking on Sunday, under penalty of ten shillings for each person so entertained or suffered; and every person so drinking or abiding is liable to be fined from five shillings to ten shillings. On every conviction after the first, the licensed person pays twenty shillings, and for the third offence loses his license, which cannot be renewed for three years. ¶

Prisoners confined in jail, either on conviction and sentence for any crime, or upon charge of any crime before conviction, are not allowed to have or drink any spirituous liquor, except it is ordered by the attending physician. Any jailer suffering such prisoners to have or drink any spirit, forfeits twenty five dollars for the first offence, and fifty dollars for the second, besides being removed from his office, and is rendered incapable of holding the office of sheriff, deputy sheriff, or jailer, for five years. **

* Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 17.
† Mass. st. 1818, c. 65, s. 1.
‡ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 18.
§ Mass. st. 1786, c. 68, s. 19.
‖ Mass. st. 1818, c. 65, s. 2.
¶ Mass. st. 1791, c. 58, s. 3.
** Mass. st. 1817, c. 149, s. 3, 4.

Common drunkards are liable to be sent to the House of Correction. *

Intemperate persons wasting their estate, are liable to be put under guardianship. †

We have thus stated the statutes of this State which are intended to repress intemperance, as the first step to an improvement in the laws, though too often forgotten by our lawgivers, is, to understand those which are now in operation. The present system for regulating the sale of spirits, and the management of licensed houses, seems on paper to be excellent. Requiring every licensed person to produce a certificate of good character and good conduct from the selectmen, every year, ought, one would think, to confine licenses to proper persons; while the minute regulations for the good order of licensed houses and shops, the restricting their number to what is necessary for the public good, and prohibiting retailers from having ardent liquors drank on their premises, appear to present obstacles in the way of intemperance not easily to be surmounted. But there is reason to fear that some of these statutes are practically a dead letter; that any person can get a certificate of good character, where it is not notoriously and outrageously bad; that very little attempt is made to regulate the number of licensed persons by the rule of the public good, and we know that retailers of spirits very frequently allow liquors to be drunk on their premises. We do not undertake to say that any one is to blame because these laws are not better enforced. It may be that from the state of society it is morally impossible to enforce them; and it may be that some of them require that sort of paternal vigilance in the selectmen and other authorities, which is only practicable in very small communities.

Though the laws for punishing intemperate persons by sending them to the house of correction and putting them under guardianship, are very proper regulations for taking care of troublesome persons, they have but a slight tendency to check intemperance. Those who are exposed to these punishments are generally too far advanced in bad habits to be reformed by them; and the fear of the disgraceful punishments which await the last stages of vice, seldom enters into the consideration of those who are just commencing the career of intemperance. No man, until his habits are too much strengthened to be broken by any common force, thinks for a single moment of the possibility that he may ever suffer punishment as a confirmed drunkard. Indeed, if the prospect of disgrace and ruin, which are the sure

* Mass. st. 1787, c. 54, s. 2. † Mass. st. 1788, c. 38, s. 7.

consequences of habitual intemperance, will not deter men from vicious indulgence they cannot be moved by the dread of any penalties which may be provided by legislative enactments.

It has been sometimes recommended to make every act of drunkenness punishable as a crime in the manner our forefathers did. But, without entering into the inquiry as to the cases in which society has a right to visit personal vices by public punishments, there seem some obvious objections to such a course. In the first place a law of the kind proposed would be imperfectly executed. The acquaintances and relations of offenders would rarely consent to complain against them, and the community at large would feel a great reluctance, except in very gross cases, to have any punishment inflicted for such offences.

But even in cases in which the law would be executed, we doubt whether it would have the desired effect, either in reforming the offenders, or in deterring others from the same excesses. If the persons convicted of acts of drunkenness be confirmed drunkards, no one can have the smallest hope that they would be reformed by any punishment. If they are just entering on habits of excess, and this indeed is the only class on which the law could be expected to have any effect, we believe that at least as many would be hardened and confirmed in their vicious courses, by the shame and disgrace of public exposure, as would be reformed. With regard to men of good character and sobriety, who might be inadvertently led into a single act of excess, any punishment in a court of justice would be too severe.

Nor do we think that punishing single acts of intemperance, would have any efficacy as an example to deter others. If, as we have said before, the terrible consequences of indulgence in ardent liquors, which are even now obvious to the most ignorant, and obtrude themselves on the most unobservant, will not deter men from vicious courses, the dread of a slight punishment can have no influence.

It seems to us, therefore, that nothing could be gained by increasing the punishments of drunkenness, and that the statutes regulating licensed persons, do not require any essential amendments. The laws, to reach the evil, must attack it in its early stages, before bad habits are formed and strengthened. If we regard the causes which mainly contribute to form these habits, we shall see at once the place to which the remedy should be applied. It is evident that among the chief causes of the prevalence of intemperance in this country, are the cheapness of strong liquors, and the numerous facilities which are given to indulgence in them. In our large cities there is a dram shop at

every corner. Those who are forming a taste for spirits are solicited at every turn. And the price which they are required to pay is so small, that it is no wonder so many are unable to resist the temptation. Nothing therefore would check intemperance so much as to increase the price of spirits, and diminish the number of places at which the poison may be drunk. Both of these objects probably, but certainly the latter, would be promoted by increasing the price of licenses. The sum of four dollars, now required to be paid, is so small as to be within the means of almost any person. Let it be raised to twenty, thirty, or fifty dollars, and the number of persons applying for licenses would be very sensibly reduced. In New York an excise duty of from five to fifty dollars, at the discretion of the commissioner, is required from every person licensed to retail spirits in the city of New York, and from five to thirty dollars in other parts of the State. We should, however, be in favor of an invariable sum, as fifty dollars for Boston, and twenty-five dollars for other parts of the State. That the proposed measure would have the effect of diminishing the number of licensed houses, is evident from the effect of the United States law laying a duty on licenses. The duties imposed by this law varied from ten to twentyfive dollars.* Mr Palfrey states that 'in three years from the beginning of 1814, after which the internal duty levied by the general government became payable, fewer licenses by far were taken out in the counties of Suffolk and Essex, than in the years before and since, and there is no reason to doubt that the same was the consequence elsewhere.'†

It is worthy of remark, that for a long course of years under the colonial and provincial governments, every retailer was obliged to pay an excise duty of 50*s*. for every butt of wine sold by him at retail, and 2*d*. a quart on all strong waters. This law, it is believed, continued in force until after the revolution. It must, we should think, have operated as a far heavier tax than that now proposed.

To give full effect to a law of the kind proposed, the societies for the suppression of intemperance might make it a part of the duty of the members, to see that the laws against retailing spirits without license, and prohibiting retailers from allowing spirits to be drunk in their shops, are duly enforced. It would be easy for a certain number of members to act as a committee for this purpose, for a limited district, as for a town or part of a town in

* Acts of 18th Congress, c. 38. s. 4—4 U. S. Laws, Bioren's Ed. 613.
† p. 85.

the country, and for a ward or part of a ward, in Boston. These members should agree to prosecute all offenders in the particulars abovementioned, within the limits assigned them, the expenses attending such prosecutions to be defrayed from the funds of the society, and any fines received by the prosecutors to be for the use of the society. We believe that there is virtue enough in the community to support and encourage any attempts of this kind. The labor on any individual would not be very oppressive, especially if proper exertions were made to secure a sufficient number of members for such associations.

Another means of checking intemperance by increasing the price of spirits, which is often spoken of, is laying an excise duty on all spirits of domestic manufacture. We are aware that many persons of great respectability believe this will have no tendency to produce the desired effect, unless the duty be enormously high, and that a very high duty would encourage the illicit manufacture of the article. We allow that an excessive duty ought not to be laid, because it might have this consequence; but we still think that a moderate one would produce a beneficial effect, and however small this effect may be, still it is desirable. It ought besides to be recollected that the duty paid on a gallon of whiskey, will increase the price of the article at retail more than the amount of the duty; for the distiller must have his profit upon the excise as well as upon every other part of the cost of production, and every other hand through which the article passes to the consumer, must receive a like profit. But that a duty, however slight, will effectually diminish the quantity of the article consumed, will not be doubted by those who have observed the immediate and decided reduction of consumption, in articles of general use, which often takes place, as soon as the duty upon them is raised, however slightly. The barometer shows the pressure of the atmosphere scarcely more instantaneously and certainly, than consumption does the pressure of taxation. It is true that where the tax is light, there may be few people who would be unable to use the same quantity of the taxed article which they had done previously. But the increased price of any article of general consumption, always induces people to economize in it, while a low price renders them lavish in its use. It has often happened in Great Britain, that when the duty on an article was increased, not only was there less of that article consumed, but a less quantity of money was spent upon it than there was before the increase of duty; and that a reduction of the duty has produced an increased revenue, partly, no doubt, in consequence of the check given to smug-

gling by diminishing its profits, but probably in a great degree from increased consumption.

It will no doubt be said, that this is an odious tax, and will not be endured; that we should yield to the prejudices of the people, and not resist them. But we cannot acquiesce in this reasoning. It is the duty of every enlightened legislature to protect the people from their own ignorance and folly, to resist the current of popular feeling. It is not for Congress to inquire whether all classes of people will be pleased to have an excise on spirits, whether the distillers and drinkers of rum and whiskey will be the advocates of such a measure; but merely whether it can be carried into operation so as to promote the public welfare. The experiment has been twice tried, and both times successfully. In 1791 a statute was passed laying a duty on spirits distilled in the United States. These excise duties, modified by various statutes, were levied until 1802, when all the statutes on the subject were repealed. In 1813 an act was passed for laying duties on licenses to distil spirituous liquors, in proportion to the capacity of the still; and at the end of 1814, a duty of twenty cents a gallon was laid on all spirits distilled in the United States, in addition to the duty on licenses. These duties ceased at the end of the year 1817.*

It is much to be regretted that these acts have been repealed, it is so difficult to pass any new laws on such a subject, and to put a new system in operation. Even those who are doubtful whether any excise on ardent spirits will produce the good moral effect which is expected, would, we should think, be in favor of introducing it, that the experiment may be fairly tried. There surely can be no more suitable object of taxation for the sake of revenue than ardent spirits. They are a luxury, and a luxury of the worst kind. The large revenue, which can unquestionably be raised from this duty, without injury or inconvenience, should be decisive in its favor.

It is however said, with great seriousness and by men in high station, that domestic spirits ought not to be taxed, because it

*Our limits do not permit us to give a full statement of all the statutes on this subject passed by the United States. The duties by the statute of 1791 varied from nine to thirty cents a gallon, according to the proof, and their being distilled from domestic or foreign materials. In 1792, by a new act, the duties were made from seven to twentyfive cents a gallon. By the act of 1814 the duty paid for licenses for stills employed on domestic materials, was $1,08 a year, which in 1816 was raised to $2,16, for each gallon of the capacity of the still, and for those employed on foreign materials $1,35, which in 1816 was raised to $2,70. The duty was proportionally higher for shorter periods. A particular account of these statutes, and of the revenues raised by them, may be found in Seybert's Statistics, p. 455 to 464.

would discourage national industry and injure the agricultural interest. As if the pecuniary interest of one part of the community, was to be weighed against the lives and morals of another part! As if the manufacture of poison was to be encouraged for the benefit of agriculture!

We might enlarge on the subject before us, but we have already trespassed beyond the limits we had at first assigned to ourselves. That the great efforts which have been made, and are still making, throughout our country, to promote temperance, will produce a deep and lasting good impression, seems to us certain. To those, however, who feel doubtful of success in this cause, we recommend the following extract from the last of Mr Palfrey's Discourses.

'In presuming to suggest remedies, my friends, I have by no means overlooked or underrated the difficulties of the case. But I also remember, that difficulties are the instituted occasion in the order of Providence for calling out great wisdom and vigor. I call to mind words of the president of that society to which I have referred as successfully labouring in this cause;* a great and good man, whose devotions were used to ascend here with yours for a divine blessing on all good counsels and all just works, and whose heart, I doubt not, was often warmed with yours by the breathings of love to God and man, which then fell here from most persuasive lips. He had this cause much at heart. His large and earnest mind counted the obstacles, but it was the better to meet them. "As the object is good," said he, "so it is practicable." I love to repeat that saying. *The object is good; therefore it is practicable.* It is an enterprise against that which is, by eminence, *the* misfortune, *the* danger of our beloved country; the blot on the fair works of God among us; the weapon of the prince of darkness. It has a right then to the services of every prudent man, every patriotic citizen, every disciple of Christ; and it asks the benefit of no other services than those, effectually to maintain itself. I desire more and more to realize, for it is a truth which all religion establishes, and all future experience is to seal, that under the government of a God who hath pleasure in righteousness and favor for its toils, single minded men need no other omen for the conquest, in due time, over any difficulties, than the omen of A GOOD CAUSE.' pp. 109–111.

We hope hereafter to discuss some other topics connected with the subject that we have been considering, which will give us an opportunity to notice other important publications respecting intemperance, besides those named at the head of this article.

* 'The late Honorable Samuel Dexter.'

ART. VIII.—1. *The Future Punishment of Infants not a Doctrine of Calvinism; 2. The Future Punishment of Infants never a Doctrine of the Calvinistic Churches; 3. On the Future State of Infants;—three Letters addressed 'To the Editor of the Christian Examiner, and published in 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' for January, February, and March.* By the Rev. LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Boston. Pierce & Williams. 1828. 8vo. pp. 43.

IN our number for September and October last we published an article upon a note of Dr Beecher's respecting the Calvinistic doctrine of infant damnation, to which he has in these Letters attempted an answer. 'In the article before me,' he tells us, 'I seem to the writer to have made statements, which put me out of the pale of reputable controversy, and which if not done ignorantly, must leave a deep stain upon my character.' We are glad to find one sentence of his, in which he has neither perverted our meaning, nor misconceived what may be the issue of this discussion. But the exception in favor of his ignorance, which we made at first, we cannot in conscience make now. Indeed, we are disposed to think we were wrong to make it at all. In that note he accused us, and all, who charge upon Calvinism and approved Calvinistic writers 'the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned,' of propagating a slander—a bearing of false witness against neighbours. Now if Dr Beecher did not know, that such writers nevertheless do expressly maintain that doctrine, and defend it as an essential part of the Calvinistic system, his bold accusation of those better informed, accompanied with an acknowledgement that he had not examined the point, might admit of some apology. What strikes our own minds as 'monstrous,' it is very hard to believe can appear in a totally different light to those with whom we are 'conversant;' and a zeal for the honor of one's intimates, in itself so commendable, might find pardon for a few hasty words intended to relieve them of a false and injurious imputation. But when irresistible evidence that the imputation is just, may be had for the asking; when, to come directly to the case before us, Dr Beecher had only to turn over a few standard Calvinistic authors to be satisfied, on their own testimony, that they have not, as he imprudently asserts, been misrepresented, holding expressly that infants, dying without actual transgression, are yet damned to all eternity for their original sin—in such circumstances to call names, and that too

with a great show of deliberation, and a great parade of competency to speak authoritatively on the subject, is utterly unpardonable. Ignorance, instead of an excuse, becomes, in such case, a chief part of the crime. Unknowingly to make a false statement, and to attack the reputation of others on the pretence of accurate and laboriously collected evidence of its truth, when no such evidence is produced or even exists, in our estimation differs but little, in point of moral character, from denying what we know to be true.

Still, the papers before us require at our hands some kind of attention. The author's palpable attempts to evade the question at issue by a frequent and fretful shifting of positions, his suppressing of passages or clauses material to a just representation of the real sentiments of the writer he is quoting, his lofty pretensions to extensive reading in theology unsupported by the least evidence of learning, and, above all, the unblushing dogmatism that throughout characterizes these extraordinary productions,—these things, though sure to find their just estimation with such as are accustomed to abstract reasonings, or are possessed of the scantiest share of theological knowledge, may yet impose upon the ill informed, and lead them to conclusions essentially false and mischievous. Bold assertions, even against the evidence of notorious facts, especially if made by a minister of Christ, are, by their very boldness, well fitted to silence doubts and prevent investigation. The office of the man carries with it something of the holiness and authority of the Teacher sent from God whose servant he professes to be, and that often too readily passes for true, which all are prompt to say, ought not to be false. With this apology—for we think an apology necessary—we shall occupy as few pages as possible with a reply to these writings, out of the pale of reputable controversy though the writer has put himself, and seems inclined, should his statements prove to be false, to admit himself to be.

The Letters present us with so many matters irrelevant to the subject they presume to discuss, that it is necessary to settle clearly at the outset, what is the precise point in dispute. The history of the case is this. In 1808 Mr Beecher delivered a sermon on the Government of God, in which he incidentally combatted the doctrine of Calvin and his followers, that the number of the saved bears a small proportion to that of the damned; a doctrine, which has always been matter of reproach to his party, and from the odium of which it is very natural that such as suffer themselves to be called Calvinists,

without well knowing what Calvinism is, should wish to be freed. Nineteen years elapse, and Dr Beecher finds the people dissatisfied with another 'monstrous' doctrine of the same school, and, not content, as in the former instance, with merely giving his own views of the subject, he ventures to speak in behalf of the whole Calvinistic party of past and present times, and on putting his sermon to the press for the seventh time, adds for the first time, the note which has occasioned this controversy, and which we shall once more transcribe for our readers. It is as follows;—

'I am aware that Calvinists are represented as believing, and teaching, the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned, and that hell is doubtless paved with their bones. But having passed the age of fifty, and been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic writers, and personally acquainted with many of the most distinguished Calvinistic divines in New-England, and in the middle and southern and western States, I must say, that I have never seen nor heard of any book which contained such a sentiment, nor a man, minister, or layman, who believed or taught it. And I feel authorised to say, that Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation, as any of those who falsely accuse them. And I would earnestly and affectionately recommend to all persons, who have been accustomed to propagate this slander, that they commit to memory, without delay, the ninth commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not bear false-witness against thy neighbor."'

Acknowledging ourselves to be implicated in this serious charge of falsehood and slander, we attempted a defence, in which we took the plain and obvious meaning of the note to be that, according to its author, 'the doctrine of infant damnation is no part of the Calvinistic scheme, and has not been maintained in any respectable Calvinistic book, which Dr Beecher may reasonably be supposed to have seen or heard of, though he has been for thirty years *conversant* with Calvinistic writers the most approved.'* The correctness of this representation of his meaning Dr Beecher has not called in question, for the simple reason that he could not. In direct contradiction of these positions, we made it our object to produce 'authorities for asserting, that, notwithstanding Dr Beecher's formal, and, considering all circumstances, his solemn disavowal and denial, the doctrine of infant damnation has been expressly maintained by leading Calvinists, and is connected with essential, vital principles of the Calvinistic system.'† Such was the question then, and such is the question now;—Has the 'monstrous doctrine that infants are damned' been held by approved Calvinistic writers? Is it a part of the Calvinistic system? Yet he

* Christian Examiner, Vol. iv. p. 448. † Ibid. p. 431.

who should read only the Letters before us, would think our chief object had been, to fix upon the living Calvinists of Boston, of New England, or of the United States, 'the odium,' as Dr Beecher calls it, of believing what we have shown to be a Calvinistic doctrine. He is so fearful that we shall be tempted to deny this, however, that he enters into a labored argument to prove it—a step, the very necessity of which is sufficient evidence that such could not have been the case. The leading object of a writer not too contemptible for the notice of so able a logician and accomplished a scholar as Dr Beecher has shown himself to be, cannot have been left a matter of doubtful inference from a detached sentence or two, but must have been put, on every page and in every line, beyond the possibility of misapprehension, and consequently beyond the necessity of argumentative proof. Although it is therefore not easy to conceive that he did not see, as distinctly as we endeavoured to make it appear, what our purpose really was, we can without difficulty account for his misrepresentation of it. Our quotations from 'approved Calvinistic writers' left him in reality but one alternative. He must either acknowledge that he had ignorantly published an indefensible charge of falsehood and slander upon the pretence of a thorough examination of evidence which he had never seen, or confess that that charge was made against his better knowledge;—a dilemma upon the horns of which it must be agonizing to be tossed, but from the one or the other of them there is so little possibility of escape, that he betrays a very natural anxiety to avail himself of the best ground on which to try his skill at evasion. Hence this array of 'living Calvinistic men.' It is a mere attempt to decoy his antagonist to another and more promising part of the field. Printed documents can hardly be made to say one thing, when they have once said another. It is not so with unwritten opinions. Their meaning is variable, and can be made to vary. Besides, the recorded page is accessible to all; the unrecorded opinion, only to a few. It is no wonder, then, that Dr Beecher, if distrustful of the testimony of books, should wish to discredit its value, and show himself fearful lest we collect our evidence against him exclusively from the dead, to the neglect of the living. Considerations like these, we say, were doubtless sufficient inducements, and we can hardly conceive of any others he could have had, for attempting to change the whole bearing of the controversy, and make it turn, not upon the question of fact respecting the teachings of approved Calvinistic writers, but upon the more doubtful one respecting the opinions of living Calvinists.

But how is Dr Beecher's object endeavoured to be accomplished? What is his argument for proving that we really meant one thing, when we have so explicitly asserted, and so constantly made it appear, that we meant quite another?—It is contained in the following extract, to which, and especially to the first paragraph, we ask the reader's particular attention.

'The whole stress of my disclaimer in the note,' he says, 'respects not the dead, but the living. The offence stated is, that I have never seen a man, neither minister nor layman, who believed or taught the doctrine. And the reference to the "most approved Calvinistic writers," was not primarily for the purpose of vindicating the dead from unjust aspersion, though this would have been a duty [?], but to vindicate the living; to disencumber myself and my brethren, and the whole Calvinistic body in New England, and the United States, of the odium attached to us by the circulation of such a falsehood. The not having met with the sentiment in the most approved Calvinistic writers is alleged in proof that it is not a sentiment adopted by Calvinists of the present day, upon the principle, that if the most approved writers do not teach it, and a living man had not been found by me who believed or taught it, the imputation must be a slander. And when, upon these grounds, I proceeded to state my disclaimer, it had, as my complaint had, exclusive reference to the living. It is that Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation, as any of those who falsely accuse them. And my closing exhortation that those who had circulated the slander, that Calvinists hold to the doctrine that infants are damned, should commit to memory without delay the ninth commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," was upon the supposition that the neighbors whom they slandered were living Calvinists, and not the dead of other ages.

'In this manner, I am happy to perceive the reviewer understood me. For he says,* "If Dr Beecher had merely told us *he* thought the doctrine of infant damnation a false one, that *he* did not believe it, and they who say *he* does believe it, bear false witness against their neighbor, our remarks and citations would have been spared. But to deny it in the name of a party, whose most accredited organ he would fain be considered; to deny it in the name of the most approved writers, who expressly state it, and, in some instances seem almost to think it a slander to be said not to hold it; and for him impudently to accuse those who, with us, charge it upon those writers and their system, of a breach of the commands of their God; this has rendered it our bounden duty to appear in self-defence."

'Now, though the reviewer, in summing up his charge against me, shrinks from the responsibility of charging the Calvinistic party directly, and in so many words, with holding the doctrine of infant damnation, and lets the charge slide off upon "those writers and their system," yet we are not to be deceived by such finesse, for he does declare that the system, which living Calvinists avow, does contain the doctrine that infants are damned; and he does give as one reason for its being his bounden duty to appear in self-defence, that I have, in the name of the Calvinistic party, disclaimed the doctrine of infant damnation, and charged him and

* If any one will be at the trouble of comparing this passage with that of which it ought to be an exact transcript, he will have a specimen of Dr Beecher's ordinary accuracy in making quotations. It may be found on the 447th page of our fourth volume.

others, with bearing false witness against their neighbors; not surely their neighbors under ground, but against living Calvinistic men.' pp. 44, 45.

Now if the reader will be at the trouble of comparing this with the note given above, he will see it to be untrue that the '*whole* stress' of Dr Beecher's 'disclaimer respected not the dead, but the living.' He was equally explicit in respect to both. No one can read that note and imagine, that, in so far as his alleged thirty years' familiarity with Calvinistic authorities and his own character for veracity could produce belief, he did not mean to have it believed, not only that the doctrine in question is not held by the great body of Calvinists of the present day, but also that it has never been held by *any* Calvinists whatever, ancient or modern, living or dead. 'I have never seen or heard,' he says, 'of *any* book which contained such a sentiment.' 'I have never seen or *heard* of a man, minister, or layman, who believed or taught it.' This certainly was intended, if there be any meaning in the words, to apply as well to Calvin and Turretin, to Twiss, Edwards, and Bellamy, or to *any* of their party Dr Beecher may be supposed to have 'heard of,' as to Hopkins or Fuller, West, Strong, or the professors at Andover, to whom, as living and later Calvinists, it now seems we were bound to confine our attention. Yet 'when he proceeded to state his disclaimer, it had, as his complaint had, *exclusive* reference to the living!' Who, then, would suppose, that after this, one word was to be said with regard to the sentiments of such Calvinists as we have quoted, or that the whole point as to them was not conceded?

Again;—'The *offence stated* is, that I have never seen a man, neither minister nor layman, who believed or taught the doctrine.' This, we allow, would be something to Dr Beecher's purpose, if it were only true. But the fact is that these words of his note are never quoted or referred to, except once, in the whole course of our review, and then, merely for the purpose of describing Dr Beecher. Instead of saying 'the eye or ear of Dr Beecher,' we said, 'the eye or ear of *him who has never seen or heard, &c.*' Such, we repeat it, is all the notice we have ever taken of his assertions respecting either the ministers or the laymen he has seen, and yet, from the statement we are considering, who would not infer, that the whole force of our argument had been made to bear upon the question of their truth or falsehood? a question which we left untouched and as we found it. The whole scope of the paragraph in which the

words occur,* related to the printed authorities we were about to cite, not at all to the 'men Dr Beecher had seen.'

Another point is, that one reason for our appearing in self-defence, was, that Dr Beecher 'disclaimed the doctrine of infant damnation in the name of the Calvinistic party.' Therefore, he says, the reviewer's object must have been to render the 'Orthodox around' him odious, by fixing upon living Calvinists the disgrace of believing a doctrine, which is one of those that Calvin, as we shall soon see, thought Servetus ought to be burnt for *not* believing. Now we are not logicians enough to see the necessity of any such conclusion. The charge against which we felt it our duty to defend ourselves, was what we regarded, and still regard, as an 'impudent' accusation of falsehood and slander, for asserting that infant damnation is a doctrine of Calvinism, and has been held to be such by Calvinistic writers. Now if Dr Beecher had made this charge exclusively in his own name, his high office and the confident tone in which it was uttered, would have been reasons enough for an attempt to repel it. But he pretended to speak as the organ of his party; and though we did not believe at the time, and have not had reason for believing since, that he was the 'accredited' organ he would fain be considered, yet the laying claim to that character, we were aware, would give some additional show of authority for his charge, at least till the claim was proved to be baseless—a work which Dr Beecher himself seems in a fair way to accomplish without our assistance. It is thus that his speaking in the name of the 'great body' of living Calvinists, became a reason for our appearing in selfdefence, and not because we were anxious, or at all bound, to go from house to house, and catechise the 'Orthodox of Boston and its vicinity,' touching their soundness in the faith of their master.

But there is yet another of Dr Beecher's 'considerations' to show that our purpose was to 'slander' the living. Although we scrupulously confined the course of our remarks to 'those writers and their system,' still, he says, 'we did declare that the system which modern Calvinists avow, does contain the doctrine that infants are damned.' Hence, to assert, as we do, that all our quotations were intended to show only a real and acknowledged connexion of the doctrine with essential principles of *Calvinism*, is mere 'finesse,'—the real object being to prove it upon the living professors of Andover, or at least upon the 'great body of living Calvinists' of the New England school,

* Examiner, Vol. IV. p. 488.

comprehending 'two thirds, if not three quarters of the evangelical divines in the United States,' who, according to Dr Beecher himself, believe quite another gospel! Is there such a thing, then, as rejecting the 'peculiar doctrines' of a system, and yet having a right to a name, to which a belief in that system is the only legitimate title? And is it Dr Beecher who says this? Are Unitarians Christians? Unitarians, who deny a total depravity, an infinite atonement, the trinity of the Godhead, and *all* 'the peculiar doctrines' of Christianity? If they acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ of God, we, indeed, admit that they are; and that too, even should they reject doctrines which we might happen to think peculiar to his religion, provided they themselves cannot in conscience regard them as taught on his authority. And so with respect to those who at the present day claim to be called Calvinists, though they disavow a belief in the imputation of Adam's sin, the comparatively small number of the elect, and many other doctrines, which, to our apprehension, are so unquestionably taught by Calvinism. If they are honest in that disavowal, and still sincerely profess allegiance to Calvin as their master in the interpretation of Christianity, we are willing to call them Calvinists. But, in both instances, the right to the name essentially depends on the belief of those who assume it, that the doctrines they reject, are neither in the one case Christian doctrines, nor in the other, Calvinistic. But the Orthodox view this matter in a very different light. For, though they have not yet had the open hardihood to say that Unitarians knowingly deny the truth of Christian principles, they do, for rejecting what the Orthodox regard as such, refuse them the Christian name. How, then, Dr Beecher, an Orthodox man, can consistently call himself and his party, Calvinists, and yet acknowledge that he and they have so essentially modified the Calvinistic system, as to make what was once true of it, now to be false, and that too, in so vital a point as the imputation of Adam's sin and its kindred doctrines, we are utterly unable to explain, except upon the ground of his being, what in the beginning of these Letters he describes himself to be, a man who, 'in matters of importance, is not disposed to stand about trifles.' On his own principles, therefore, the principles on which he maintains that Unitarians are not Christians, how can he possibly say, that in declaring that the doctrine of infant damnation is contained in the Calvinistic system, we necessarily declare that the great body of those who now call themselves Calvinists, believe it? He might, with equal reason, urge a declaration that

Christianity contains the doctrine of transubstantiation, in proof that it is imputed to the great body of those who pretend a right to the Christian name. On his principles, the principles on which he and his party hold that Unitarians are not Christians, we should not hesitate to say, that they are not Calvinists, who do not believe that infants are damned. But upon our own principles, the only language we are authorised to hold, is, that such Calvinists are not consistent. And that is precisely the language we made use of in our review. For we have as yet nowhere said, that 'the system, which living Calvinists avow, does contain the doctrine that infants are damned,' if by that system is meant, as Dr Beecher seems to admit, a very different system from the one avowed by Calvin and the Reformers, which, in our view, is the only true Calvinism. The words ascribed to us, are Dr Beecher's own, not ours. Even the words he refers to and misrepresents, were not ours; for we quoted them from a writer, who said, what since the change of '*views and language*' Dr Beecher speaks of, we may be pardoned for not thinking to be very wide of the truth; viz. that infant damnation is a doctrine 'which follows necessarily from the Calvinistic system, and which would now be insisted on by all real *and consistent* Calvinists, if they thought their people would bear it.'

Such and so successful is Dr Beecher's first attempt to evade the real question at issue between him and us. He has picked out here and there a casual remark or allusion of ours, which he has either perverted or misunderstood, and, by dint of these and a palpable misrepresentation of the extent of his 'disclaimer,' and of our statement of his offence, would persuade his readers that he is replying to our arguments in relation to a point, which, if they will examine our review, they will find we never touched. We say this, however, and have been at some pains to prove it, not because we would shrink from any responsibility we have ourselves assumed, or which may be justly, or at the call of circumstances, imposed upon us. But in the present controversy we have not yet undertaken, nor do we feel it to be our duty, to prove what we knew from the beginning it was impracticable to ascertain. With the opinions of the 'great body' of living Calvinists on the future state of infants, we have no means of becoming acquainted. Dr Beecher, indeed, tells us that they do not believe any of them will be damned. But he has shown himself so incompetent if he would, not to say so little disposed if he were able, to give a fair report of the sentiments of the dead, that with regard to the

living, we may be pardoned for hesitating to receive his testimony. Till his note and our examination of it were published, there has been no particular call for the expression of any opinion on the subject, and of Dr Beecher's voice we have not yet heard the echo.

Still, after all we have said in respect to the little concern the fact has with the true ground of this controversy, we do not doubt that there are living Calvinists who believe that infants are damned; and we are led to this conclusion by the very principles Dr Beecher himself has laid down. We may, or may not, be 'personally acquainted' with them; we may, or may not, 'ever have seen' them. Our acquaintance with living Calvinists, compared with Dr Beecher's, is very limited; nor does the the little we have, as his for 'thirty years' seems to have done, extend, in all cases, to their private opinions on this subject. But, as just observed, we cannot doubt that many Calvinists are still to be found, though we shall not be at the trouble of seeking them, who believe that infants dying without actual transgression, are damned to all eternity for their share in Adam's sin; and in thinking so, we follow the very standard of proof which Dr Beecher himself has set up. For what does he say? Why, that that *part* of 'the stress of his disclaimer,' which, though the '*whole*' of it 'respects the living,' relates to the dead, 'was not primarily for the purpose of vindicating the dead from unjust aspersion, though this would have been a duty,'* but was urged 'in proof that [infant damnation] is not a sentiment adopted by Calvinists of the present day, upon the principle, that if the most approved writers do not teach it,' it is a reason for believing that 'the imputation must be a slander.' That is, in plain terms, if the doctrine that infants are damned is not taught by approved Calvinistic authorities, it is presumptive evidence that it is not held by Calvinists of the present day.

Now we not only admit the soundness of this reasoning, but contend that it ought to have great weight. For if Augustine 'neither believed nor taught' the doctrine, we lose some proof that Calvin did. If Calvin's 'strongest passages, however tortured, cannot be made to teach any such doctrine,' we must obey the call of Dr Beecher, and, 'by all the sanctions of violated

* We can make neither English nor anything else of '*this would have been a duty*,' but must leave it with another of Dr Beecher's ingenious creations; viz. that 'traditionary fiction,' which, 'for once, retained a verbal accuracy of statement not surpassed by written documents.' Perhaps the phrases are synonymous.

justice, retract the slander we have wantonly cast upon the memory of the holy dead.' Nay, more; we must put our mouths in the dust, and confess there is much less evidence than we thought, for charging it upon approved writers of his school. And if, 'in every age, the most authentic documents stamp falsehood upon the charge so long repeated,' then, not only must 'the memory of the illustrious dead have been blackened with calumny,' but the proof so thickens and threatens, that should we open our lying lips against the living, the gathering cloud would soon burst in torrents of burning shame, and quick coming confusion upon our heads. Not 'a living Calvinistic man' would give us shelter from the storm, and should we flee to the earth to cover us, the very bones of the slandered tenants of the grave would shake trembling into every limb, and their injured shades point meaning fingers to the depths below. If the reader will pardon this flight in imitation of our author's style—this humble attempt at the 'Ithuriel touch,' * he may discover our meaning to be, that Dr Beecher's argument is an argument of greater potency than he seems to be aware of. For, if all these premises can be established, not only will they make it probable, but, considering how closely in the schools one generation follows in the doctrinal track of another, they will make it morally certain, that infant damnation is not a doctrine held by the *great body* of living Calvinists. And especially, if the Calvinists of New England have, as Dr Beecher tells us, 'changed the mode of stating the doctrine of original sin adopted by the Reformers,—for views and language which utterly preclude even the appearance which the reviewer thinks he finds of ground for such an inference' as that approved Calvinistic writers have believed and taught the doctrine, why then, in respect to them, and all of their way of thinking, the charge must, most clearly, be a 'slander.' But it is an argument of 'great potency,' and, though we make no pretensions to the 'Ithuriel touch,' and have no 'dexterity' to boast of, it may in the end bring out most startling conclusions. For if the reverse of all these premises should prove to be facts, why then the conclusion must be reversed too. If Augustine, even in the very paragraph, a part of which Dr Beecher brings in proof to the contrary, *did* teach the damnation of infants, then we may suspect that Calvin followed him. If Calvin

* 'The reviewer, I am persuaded,' says Dr Beecher, p. 151, 'is not aware of the potency of his argument, or *with what dexterity*, as with *Ithuriel touch*, it may bring out all those doctrines, &c.—He will permit me, therefore, to edify him with a few specimens.'

taught it, and indignantly appealed to it as an incontestible proof of his doctrine of the decrees, we may expect to find it in writers who bow to his authority and believe his dogmas. And if 'in every age the most authentic documents,' so far 'from stamping falsehood upon the charge,' afford it as ample a support as from the nature of the case we could expect, or for the honor of human nature we could wish, why then, the 'unjust aspersion' from which Dr Beecher would 'vindicate the dead,' becomes an aspersion they deserve. And even in regard to the New-England divinity, which, we are told, numbers among its disciples, 'two thirds, if not three quarters of the evangelical divines in the United States,' the faith even of its 'most accredited organ as he would fain be considered,' may prove, in respect to the future state of infants, of something more than suspected soundness. Consistently with his own principles, therefore, if we can establish our position with regard to such Calvinistic writers as we have quoted, it seems impossible that even Dr Beecher should have the effrontery to repeat his vulgar charge of 'falsehood and slander,' whether it concern the dead or the living. For by his own showing, we shall then have more than reason enough for suspecting, that even among the Orthodox of the present day, there are Calvinists, and they are not a few, who believe, what he from whom they take their name unquestionably held to be true, that of that portion of mankind of whom Jesus declared, 'of such is the kingdom of heaven,' many, if not the greater number, will be found at the last to belong to the kingdom of hell. We ask again then, Has the 'monstrous doctrine that infants are damned,' been held by approved Calvinistic writers? Is it a part of the Calvinistic system? This, as we have already said, was the question we originally discussed, and it is the only question relating to this subject, to which it is practicable to give a satisfactory answer. It is a question, moreover, the determination of which, according to Dr Beecher's own modes of reasoning, must go far to settle all the rest, and which we shall now once more attempt to answer.

The essential, vital principles of Calvinism with which the doctrine of infant damnation is so intimately connected, we did not need Dr Beecher to tell us, can be no other than those of original sin, and the absolute decrees of election and reprobation, as the passages we adduced from various Calvinistic writers, all of them of the highest authority, abundantly showed.

Nor did we think it best to labor much, in our own persons, to point out that connexion, when the task had been so thoroughly done to our hands by Calvin and Turretin, the Westminster Assembly of Divines, Twiss, Boston, Gill, Edwards, and Bellamy, all of whom we permitted to speak for themselves, and for us too. We shall still pursue the same course, confining ourselves principally to the question of fact respecting the sentiments of Calvinistic writers, because it is for them, not for Dr Beecher or ourselves, to decide in this controversy.

What we have already said, or cited from the authorities just named, we did think, and think still, was enough to set the point we meant to prove forever at rest. But Dr Beecher, who 'in matters of importance is not disposed to stand about trifles,' nay, who enlists in his defence even stale witticisms wrung from irreverent misapplications of what, if we mistake not, the multitude of Calvinists, and, for aught we know, he himself regards as the very words of God,*—this gentleman, who, in his earnestness to have us 'commit to memory the ninth commandment,' seems to have forgotten the third, tells us that we have totally failed to establish the point we set out to prove; that our quotations are nothing to our purpose; that we either cannot translate correctly, or have intentionally mistranslated, or garbled to suit our purposes, one of the very plainest of all Latin sentences; that in comparison with himself we know nothing of logic and but little of anything else; that we are weak, as well as ignorant, and that 'he does hope we shall go back to our hornbook, before we attempt to reason again for the edification of readers who are blessed with common sense.' Let us then go back, if not actually to 'our hornbook,' to the books we have quoted, and see if we have really made the gross mistakes imputed to us.

We shall begin, as we begun before, with Calvin himself, who, in a question respecting Calvinism, is the first, as he is unquestionably the most important witness to be examined. Dr Beecher contends that—

* In his attempt to show 'with what dexterity, as with Ithuriel touch,' our argument from Calvinistic writers may be turned against Unitarians, Dr Beecher quotes, and of course condemns, the following passage from Belsham, capitalizing what, we presume, he thinks most objectionable. 'The Scriptures,' says Belsham, 'contain a very faithful and credible account of the Christian doctrine, which is the true word of God; BUT THEY ARE NOT THEMSELVES THE WORD OF GOD.' If Dr Beecher thinks they are the word of God, in the sense in which Belsham thinks they are not, how can he reconcile his extreme levity, and even coarseness, in the use of them, with that deep reverence with which a thought so awful ought to inspire him that entertains it?

'a belief in the depravity of infants and their just exposure to punishment, is the only argument the reviewer has adduced, which goes to prove that Calvinists, as a body, ever did, or do now, believe in the damnation of infants.' p. 46.—'Calvin,' he says, 'as quoted by the reviewer, teaches only that infants are depraved, and under condemnation, which makes them *justly liable* to future punishment, but not that they are actually sent to hell.' p. 47.—'His [Calvin's] testimony, as quoted by the reviewer, concerning infants, is, that "they are born infected with the contagion of sin,"—"are, in the sight of God, polluted and defiled,"—"are all by nature children of wrath,"—that "*infants themselves* bring their damnation (condemnation)* with them from their mothers' womb,"—that "their whole nature is, as it were, a seed of sin, so that it cannot but and odious be abominable to God."' pp. 82, 83.

Such, according to Dr Beecher's admission, was the doctrine of Calvin, and such, he says, has been the belief of all Calvinistic churches and writers in all ages, including those of the present day, with himself at their head, 'as he would fain be considered.' And in so far as it affects the character of the Deity, certainly the most important light in which the whole subject can be considered, this doctrine is quite as monstrous, blasphemous, and horrible, as that of actual infant damnation. Our reasons for so regarding it we shall not here stop to produce, however, it being sufficient for our present purpose to remark, that, with the unimportant exception mentioned in the note below, not one of the quotations of which Dr Beecher has here given the substance, was brought forward to prove more than he allows them to establish. In an attempt to show the connexion of infant damnation with essential, vital principles of Calvinism, it was a primary step to show, that, according to Calvin's account of human nature, infants, as soon as, nay, even before they are born, are really wicked, and odious and abominable to God, *deserving* to be punished to all eternity in hell. This is the connexion, and all the connexion of infant damnation with original sin, certainly a vital part of the Calvinistic scheme.

* The word which Dr Beecher here softens into 'condemnation,' is, in the original, *damnatio*, and Calvin, we are inclined to think, intended to say, that 'infants themselves bring their *damnation* with them from their mothers' womb,' meaning that they bring with them their punishment, their hell, their *damnation*, or, according to a common mode of speech, that which will actually prove their punishment and send them to hell. He has been so understood by the numerous writers who have quoted this passage in evidence that he believed infants would be damned, and was probably so understood by Thomas Norton, whose version of the Institutes has passed through many editions. The one before us is the sixth, and was published in 1634. He renders the word '*damnation*,' and in his index refers to the passage, in Lib. IV. c. xv. § 10, as showing that 'infants bring their *damnation* out of their mothers', &c. However, as we do not need the quotation for our purpose, we shall not urge this interpretation of it, but adopt that which Dr Beecher of course prefers, and which the words will, perhaps, bear.

It is the decree of reprobation, which, to the praise of Calvinistic justice, casts the little ones into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, their original sin proving only that they deserve their unutterable torments. The reviewer, therefore, 'did *not* need to be told, that, while all this is testimony absolute, that Calvin believed in the depravity of infants, and their just *exposure* to damnation,' it does not teach that they are *actually* damned.

So far, then, there is no dispute about Calvin's opinions, or those of his school. But, says Dr Beecher, this great Reformer, 'the holy dead,' went no further. He taught, as all Calvinists do now, that infants *deserve*, and are *justly exposed* to the torments of the damned, but has nowhere said that those torments will be inflicted, nowhere expressed his belief in actual infant damnation. Has the world, then, been for centuries so grossly deluded; and has it waited for the day of Dr Beecher to be set right upon a point, which any one of the millions who have died in error, if he could but read Latin as well as our author, might with ease have ascertained for himself? It is even so. A learned theologian of the nineteenth century, the very age of discoveries, and of inventions, too, has examined and cross-examined our witness, and can extract from him no intimation of a doctrine, for which, for three hundred years, he has been held responsible. We therefore do not wonder, that, with the indignation of offended virtue, he should 'call upon us, by all the sanctions of violated justice, to retract the *slander* we have so *wantonly* cast upon his memory.' For Calvin, we are told,

'believed in the salvation of all infants, dying in infancy, who are within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor. This is Calvin's belief in the damnation of infants.

'Calvin, it would seem, then, came nearer to teaching the actual salvation of all infants, than the damnation of any. For, sweep a compass round all infants who die within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor, and how many will fall without the blessed circumference of mercy?

'Not a syllable, then, has been produced from Calvin, which proves that he taught that infants are damned. Hitherto, the reviewer has made the charge without evidence. And I now call upon him by all the sanctions of violated justice, to retract,' &c. pp. 86, 87.

But not only have we as yet produced no evidence of Calvin's belief in the doctrine we ascribe to him, but, upon the ground of his having particularly examined the whole subject and conscientiously reported the true result of his inquiries. Dr Beecher assures us that no such evidence can be produced, For—

'I have followed the reviewer through his windings, and mistranslations of Calvin,' he says, '*not because I could not wipe off by a shorter course, the aspersion cast on him;* but that the public may have an opportunity to decide what degree of credit is due to this anonymous Unitarian partizan writer; with what *limited knowledge* of his subject, and with what *unauthorised* confidence, he has spoken of the sentiments of Calvin concerning the future state of infants.' p. 86.

But what is his 'shorter course for wiping off the aspersion we have cast upon Calvin,' he does not anywhere tell us, unless it be in the paragraph in which he says—

'Now if we were in a court of justice, we should be permitted to cross-question these witnesses [Calvin and Augustine]. And, as a "deep stain" is likely to be fixed on our character, should we be convicted, I know not why legal evidence should not be demanded. I would take the liberty, therefore, to ask John Calvin a few questions.' p. 88.

Then follows the 'legal evidence,' and among the questions put to the witness is the following;—

Dr Beecher. 'Have you anywhere avowed your belief in the particular sentiment ascribed to Augustine—that infants are damned?'

John Calvin. 'NEVER. THE "STRONGEST PASSAGES" IN MY WRITINGS, HOWEVER TORTURED, CANNOT BE MADE TO TEACH ANY SUCH OPINION.' p. 88.

This, certainly, is speaking in plain terms, and it may very naturally be asked whether we shall presume to call in question declarations like these, made on the responsibility of a man of character, and a minister of our holy religion. Will you even attempt to disprove statements put forth with every assurance it is in the power of language to give you, that they were not made in ignorance or without examination? Can you think that a man, who has publicly, and with great apparent deliberation, accused you of 'falsehood and slander,' and is notwithstanding so tender of your everlasting welfare, as 'earnestly,' and even 'affectionately,' to recommend your committing to memory, without delay, the ninth commandment, as a protection against future temptations to violate the obligations of truth and justice—can you think that such a one would, in support of such a charge, make assertions respecting a matter of fact, which he did not *know* to be true? If declarations so positive, so full, so unequivocal, and a part of them, at least, intended to be so solemn, are not to be implicitly taken for everything that he who makes them would have them pass for, there is no safety in at all trusting to any the most common principles ordinarily relied upon in the every day intercourse of men with man. But, unfortunately, there is a boldness that is not the boldness of

knowledge, not to say, which is not the boldness of truth; and that it is the former, not the latter, which is displayed in the paragraphs above, the reader, and Dr Beecher too, must allow, when we shall have laid before them a few passages from Calvin's writings, which we, indeed, do not think stronger than the one we have already quoted and shall hereafter notice, but which it is not impossible may appear in a very different light to this learned vindicator of 'the holy dead.' Of the many that might be quoted we shall content ourselves with three, which, 'however tortured,' can hardly be made to teach anything, if they do not teach the doctrine of infant damnation.

The first passage is taken from Calvin's famous reply to Sebastian Castalio, once his friend, but, at the time that reply was written, under his displeasure for heretical opinions. Castalio had said that 'all laws, human and divine, condemn a man *after* and because of transgression. But Calvin's God *(iste Calvini Deus)* condemned and reprobated the wicked before they existed, not to say before they were wicked or had sinned; and because he damned them before they sinned, he compels them to sin, that he may seem to have damned them justly.' To this Calvin replies;—

'As to what you object, that no one is justly damned, unless on account of transgression, and after transgression; on the first point we have no dispute, since I everywhere teach that no one perishes except by the just judgment of God. Yet it cannot be dissembled that a hidden poison lurks in your words; because, if the similitude you propose is admitted, God will be unjust in that he involves the whole race of Abraham in the guilt of original sin. You deny that it is just in God to damn any one, unless on account of transgression. Persons innumerable are taken out of life while yet infants. Put forth now your virulence against *God, who* PRECIPITATES INTO ETERNAL DEATH HARMLESS INFANTS *(innoxios fœtus)* TORN FROM THEIR MOTHERS' BREASTS. He who will not detest this blasphemy [of yours] when it is openly exposed, may curse me at his will. For it cannot be demanded that I should be safe and free from the abuse of those who do not spare God.' *

Calvin, it seems, then, even thought it blasphemy to question the justice of that damnation of infants, which his generous vindicator thinks it a 'slander' to charge him with believing. What a satire upon 'the memory of the holy dead!' It is the severest of all the wounds of a friend, that which is inflicted by an indignant disavowal in our behalf, of what we have ourselves been imprudently prompt, if not proud to confess. That such is the character of Dr Beecher's zealous, but misjudged

* Tractt. Theol.—Calumniæ Nebulonis cujusdam adv. Doctrin. Joan. Calvini de Occultâ Dei Provid. et ad eas ejusdem Calvini Responsio.—Art. xiv.

defence of his master, we have yet more evidence in reserve to show.

The next passage is taken from Calvin's account of the doctrine of Servetus respecting the corruption of the human race. It is the more important, because it stands in a work which was written as an apology for putting his victim to death, and is subscribed, not only by Calvin, but by the Ministers and Pastors of the Genevan Church, to the number of fourteen. If it has not, therefore, all the formality, it has all the authority of a confession of faith, with the additional weight derived from the solemnity of the occasion on which it was published. Among the errors of Servetus, then, Calvin and the Genevan Pastors, reckoned the following.

'In the mean time certain salvation is said [by Servetus] to await all at the final judgment, except those who have brought upon themselves the punishment of eternal death by their personal sins *(propriis sceleribus)*. From which it is also inferred, that *all who are taken from life while* INFANTS AND YOUNG CHILDREN, are exempt from ETERNAL DEATH, although they are elsewhere called accursed.' *

Such is one of the tenets for which the stern Genevan thought Servetus was justly condemned to the flames, and so important a point did he consider it and its 'kindred doctrines,' that had Dr Beecher lived in his time and preached as he does now, he would himself have been in danger of the stake.

The third and last passage to which we have referred, is contained in Calvin's work on the Eternal Predestination of God. One of the persons against whom this treatise was more particularly written, was Albertus Pighius, a Catholic writer, who, it seems, was opposed to the doctrine of unconditional election, and held such opinions upon the subject as were afterwards brought into greater notoriety by Arminius and the Remonstrants. Calvin represents Pighius as saying;—

'"To those who ask a reason why the wicked are damned, will not be returned the tyrannical answer, 'That they were separated from the elect by the eternal counsel of God, because it pleased God to devote them to destruction;' as if it were said, *Sic volo, sic jubeo; sit pro ratione voluntas;* but they will hear from the lips of Christ, 'I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat, &c.'"'

'Not very unlike this,' says Calvin, 'is what he [Pighius] says in another place.'

'"Christ will not tell them they are damned because they were born of the infected race of Adam, because by his sin they contracted the desert

* Tractt. Theol.—Refut. Error. Mich. Serveti.

of eternal death, because they ought to perish for his transgression; but because they had not given meat to the hungry, and had not practised other acts of charity."

To this, Calvin replies;—

'If Pighius does not think original sin sufficient for the damnation of men, and will make no account of the secret judgment of God, what will he do with INFANT CHILDREN, who have been snatched out of this life before they were able, on account of their age, to give any such proof [of wickedness]? Since the same condition of birth and death was common to the little ones who died at Sodom and at Jerusalem, and there was no difference in their works—why WILL CHRIST, AT THE LAST DAY, SEPARATE SOME OF THEM TO HIS LEFT HAND, from others standing at his right? Who does not here adore the admirable judgment of God, in that it has been ordered that some should be born at Jerusalem, whence they presently pass to a better life, and that Sodom, the ENTRANCE OF HELL, should be the birthplace of others?' *

Calvin, then, notwithstanding Dr Beecher's word to the contrary, did believe in the actual damnation of infants, and it will throw horrible light upon the last quotation, if we call to mind the language of scripture to which he therein alludes. It is contained in the twentyfifth chapter of Matthew, and is as follows;—'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.' On the left, according to Calvin, and thousands of his followers, will stand the little ones of Sodom and Gomorrah, for whose guilt in Adam, it seems that 'fire from heaven' was not sufficient retribution. For the King 'shall say also unto THEM ON THE LEFT HAND, Depart from me, ye cursed, INTO EVERLASTING FIRE prepared for the devil and his angels.—*These* shall go away into EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT, but the righteous into life eternal.'—Such is Calvinism as taught by him from whom the system takes its name, but 'of whose writings the strongest passages, however tortured, cannot be made to teach any such opinion' as that so expressly asserted in these quotations, and implied in a thousand others.

Still, Dr Beecher, who says he has been '*conversant* with the most approved Calvinistic writers for thirty years,' and proves himself to be so intimately acquainted with the writings of Calvin, would persuade us that 'Calvin came nearer to teaching the actual salvation of all infants than the damnation of any,' because he 'believed in the salvation of all infants, dying in infan-

* Tractt. Theol.—De Æter. Dei Prædest.

cy, who are within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor.' But where has Calvin said this? Dr Beecher has not pointed us to the passage, nor do we believe he can. The only citation he adds to those made by ourselves, is an extract from Calvin's answer to the inquiry of John Knox, whether the children, not of Roman Catholics, as Dr Beecher says, but of idolaters and excommunicated persons, may be baptized. But not one word about the *future state* of infants, whether those of believers or others, does either the extract or the whole letter contain. Calvin there says, indeed, as he had said in the quotations we made in our review, that '*the promise* comprehends not only the offspring of each of the faithful in the first degree, but is extended to a thousand generations.' But the point we disputed was, 'Whether this promise necessarily implies in the infants of those to whom it appertains, that sort of holiness which in itself affords any hope of their salvation.' The children of believers Calvin, it is true, considered 'holy,' that is, within the covenant, and therefore entitled to the sign of baptism. But, as we have elsewhere remarked, he distinguishes between the outward calling and election of a nation or body of men to certain privileges and distinctions, and that special election and effectual calling of individuals which is essential to future salvation. Now the promise to Abraham relating to the former and not necessarily to the latter, we contended that Calvin's language in regard to it, when properly explained, gives us no more assurance of the salvation of all the infants of believers, than it does of the whole race of Abraham, or of the whole christian race, many of whom he unquestionably thought would be eternally reprobated. Besides, we have proved that he certainly did consign some infants, with their parents, to the torments of hell. But if he believed, literally, that all infants, who die within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor, are sure of salvation, 'the sweep' of his 'compass' would not have left these little ones to 'fall without the blessed circumference of mercy.' That is to say, believing in the damnation of some infants who have died in infancy, Calvin could not have believed in the salvation of all literally within a thousand generations of a pious ancestor, because, even to this day, there have not been half that number of generations upon earth.

But Dr Beecher, in reply to a remark of ours, says—

'Grotius, it seems, had slandered Calvin, as Unitarians now do, representing it as his doctrine, "that, from the breast of the same Christian mother, one child was conveyed to heaven, and another to hell." And Rivet, as we now do, vindicated Calvin, maintaining that

"Calvin, and Calvinists in general, taught that the infants of believers, dying before they were capable of any moral act, were saved." And, really,' continues our author, 'we should have supposed Rivet's express testimony, and Calvin's express words, to be as good evidence as the reasoning of the reviewer to the contrary.' p. 85.

But Rivet's 'express testimony' amounts only to Rivet's reasoning, and why we should admit his arguments to the exclusion of our own, which we think to be better, we are at a loss to determine. As to Calvin's 'express words,' we can only remark, that, granting him to have used them, we still have, as we had before, a word to say upon the score of his consistency. We are acquainted with no expressions of Calvin's, relating to this subject, stronger than the following.

'If at this time any do sharply and with strong reasons defend Pædobaptism, I certainly am one of the number. Nor, as to the cause or end, is it disputed but that they are therefore baptized, that, being grafted upon the body of Christ, they may be freed from eternal destruction, obtain remission of the sin that is bred in them by nature, be clothed with gratuitous righteousness. * * * I do not grant that a child, who is taken off by sudden death before he could be offered for baptism, is therefore to be excluded from the kingdom of God. * * * For the children of believers were adopted by the Lord before they were born, when he said, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed." Nothing can be more certain than that the salvation *(salutem)* of infants is contained in this promise.' *

At first sight, 'express words' like these, do seem to assure us that all infants of believers are safe. But Calvin might, in consistency with his principles, hold the very same language of the adult, as well as infant heirs of the promise. It will apply as well to those infants who live and become men, as to those who die in infancy. The former, as well as the latter, are baptized *that they may escape* eternal death, obtain the remission of original sin, &c., and nothing can be more certain than that the salvation of such is contained in this promise. Still, many of them are not elected, but, according to Calvin, are eternally damned. Though by birth, or according to the flesh, they are entitled to the promise, in so far as it respects external privileges, they fail of becoming what he a little below calls the '*genuine* children of Abraham,' and are lost. If, then, Calvin's doctrine of predestination, as Dr Beecher grants, applies equally to infants and adults, why election and reprobation, which are but correlative parts of predestination, should not both apply to a particular class of infants, when there is no class of adults exempt from their application, we need Dr

* Tractt. Theol.—Append. Libel. de Vera Eccles. Ref. Ratione.

Beecher's proficiency in logic to enable us to see. Till we make the discovery, however, we cannot condemn Grotius, whatever Rivet may have done, for charging upon Calvin's doctrine, the conveying from the breast of the same christian mother, one child to heaven, and another to hell.

As to Rivet, we not only 'seemed to admit,' but expressly admitted, that he 'held, with Calvinists in general, that the infants of believers are saved.' But such a statement of his doctrine as would make it teach 'an hereditary succession to the aristocracy of the saints, the continual transmission of the privilege of election by birthright, and the being born an heir of salvation in virtue of natural descent,' we did think too gross, and too inconsistent with obvious facts, to be assented to by any one. But not so Dr Beecher. For 'Rivet,' he says, 'believed it, although "it cannot be believed by any one." And why,' he asks, 'might not Calvin?' This, then, according to Dr Beecher, is the doctrine of Calvin and his disciples generally, 'when clearly and fully stated!' But Calvin's doctrine it certainly was not, because, as we remarked in our review, he has explained how it is, that, 'when the children of pious men are holy, still many of them are degenerate.' Respecting Rivet, we have only Dr Beecher's word in proof that he believed it, and if the 'great body of living Calvinists,' whose most accredited organ Dr Beecher would fain be considered, have authorised him to say that they assent to such a statement of the doctrine, there has indeed been 'a change of views and language' going on, of which we, certainly, have been totally ignorant, but which, instead of resulting in such an improvement in the mode of stating the principles of Calvinism as will divest them of their horrors and make them popular, will go far to render them ridiculous.

But it is of little importance to our present inquiry, what Calvin, or Rivet, or any one else, has said or thought respecting any particular class of infants. Calvin, as we have already shown, and Rivet, as we shall show hereafter, believed in actual infant damnation, which is all we are required to prove. But why, it may be asked, was not this proved, at least in respect to Calvin, in the original examination of Dr Beecher's note? His works were as accessible then as they are now, and contained the same evidences of his faith. To this we answer, that it *was* so proved. After citing passages to show he believed that infants, even before they are born, *deserve* damnation, we quoted another passage which proves, incontestibly, that he thought infants were damned. That passage, we repeat, was, in connexion with the others, full and incontestible

evidence that we had not misrepresented either Calvin or Calvinism on this point, and we therefore quoted no more. Dr Beecher himself admits it to be completely 'decisive,' provided it ought to be understood as we translated it. We shall therefore transcribe the original, the translation of Professor Norton, that of Allen, which is adopted by Dr Beecher, and our own translation, and demonstrate that Professor Norton's and our own are both correct, and Allen's indefensible.

In every edition of Calvin's Institutes, in which we have found the passage in question,* it stands, not as Dr Beecher has given it, but thus;—

'Iterum quæro, Unde factum est ut tot gentes unà cum liberis eorum infantibus æternæ morti involveret lapsus Adæ absque remedio, nisi quia Deo ita visum est?'—'Decretum quidem horribile, fateor.' †

For reasons that will be obvious, and for others doubtless suggested by his intimate acquaintance with the language, Dr Beecher gives the sentence a new punctuation, with various readings, as follows;—

'Iterum quæro, unde factum est ut tot gentes, una cum liberis eorum infantibus, æternæ morti involueret lapsus Adæ, absque remedio, nisi quia Deo visum est. Decretum quidem horribile, fateor.' p. 83.

Professor Norton renders the passage thus;—

'I ask again; how it has come to pass, that the fall of Adam has involved so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, and this without remedy; but because such was the will of God.' * * * * 'It is a dreadful decree I confess.' ‡

We next give Allen's translation.

'I inquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, but because such was the will of God.'—'It is an awful decree, I confess.'

Lastly, our own rendering is as follows;—

'*I ask again*, How has it happened that the fall of Adam has involved so many nations, *with their infant children*, in eternal death *without remedy*, but because it so seemed good in the sight of God?'—'It is a dreadful decree, I confess.'

* We say 'in every edition in which we have found the passage,' because we have before us one, evidently of a very early date, but without a titlepage or imprint, in which it is not to be found; or certainly not in the connexion in which it stands in later copies. The same is true of nearly the whole of the section in which it occurs.

† Inst. Lib. iii. c. xxiii. § 7.

‡ Views of Calvinism, Christ. Disciple, New Series, Vol. iv. p. 254.

Here, before defending our translation against objections, which, we are bold to say, no scholar would ever have dreamed of, there is demanded of us a word of explanation, if not of rebuke. In giving this citation from Calvin, through what Dr Beecher *must have believed* was either mere carelessness in correcting the press, or a willingness to abate something of the force of the passage as an evidence to our purpose, we omitted the words 'without remedy,' answering to *absque remedio* in the original.* We say *he must have believed this;* for he tells us that Professor Norton and the reviewer have both mistranslated Calvin. But in nothing, at all affecting the sense, do our respective versions differ from Allen's, which is admitted to be correct, except in the rendering, or omitting to render, *absque remedio.* Strike from Professor Norton's and Allen's, their renderings of those two words, and the three versions will all say precisely the same thing, and all three will be equally undeniable proofs of Calvin's belief in infant damnation. When, therefore, Dr Beecher said that Professor Norton and the reviewer had both mistranslated Calvin, there must have been a conviction in his mind that we both understood the passage in the same way. Indeed all his reasoning against the reviewer, is upon this supposition, and would be nugatory without it. If he thought upon the subject at all, *he must*, therefore, *have believed*, either that our omission of the two words was merely accidental, which is the truth, or, if intentional, a voluntary relinquishment on our part, of what would have made the quotation still more decisively to our purpose, if it had been retained. For, as the passage stood, Calvin says simply, that 'infants are involved in eternal death.' But had it included the omitted words, translated according to what Dr Beecher *evidently be-*

* We would here say that for this omission no one but the Editor is *in any way* answerable, did we not know that the gentleman, whom *Dr Beecher* has presumed in words, though we do not believe he has dared in thought, to accuse of a pitiful conspiracy in the case, might justly think himself degraded, should a word be uttered to defend him against a charge, which was so clearly made, not only merely to serve a turn, but with an evident consciousness of its hollowness. But be this as it may, the writer that accuses another of mistranslation or misquotation, doubtless will take all the precautions he knows how to employ, to be accurate himself. While it is therefore just to infer that Dr Beecher's 'filled with punishment,' for *pœnâ plectendos*, p. 88, his *involueret*, p. 83, and his *damnatione mitissime*, p. 88, are mere sins of ignorance, his giving an unauthorised pointing to the very passage he complains of us for not giving correctly, as it could not have been the result of accident, so does it justly expose him to the severest reprehension. Why, the omission of the word *ita* in the passage under consideration, innocent as it is, affords more reasonable ground for suspecting Dr Beecher of an evil intention, than there was for supposing that we thus omitted *absque remedio*, because his omission is only of no importance, while ours was clearly against our interest.

lieved was our understanding of them, it would have made Calvin say, that 'infants are involved in eternal death without remedy;' *i. e.* that they are not only damned, but remediless damned. If, then, the words were left out from any motive at all, it must have been from a motive which ought to have procured us, not Dr Beecher's abuse, but his thanks. Thus, we repeat it, *he must have believed* the matter really stood; yet, although such is the case, we shall not defile our pages by applying the proper epithets to his *pretending* to account for the omission by an insinuation, which to have made, in these circumstances, argues no small degree of the very unworthiness, which, *as he says*, seems to him to be implied in us. Publicly arraigned on a charge, which, if proved, he himself appears not unwilling to admit must seriously affect his character, he doubtless thought he should find it easier to defend himself against it, could he succeed in an attempt to cast suspicion upon the integrity of his accusers. But he should have remembered that a failure in that attempt, would render his task tenfold more difficult than it would have been if he had never made it, by proving him capable of the conduct with which he stands charged.

We are now prepared to examine Dr Beecher's learned effort to show, that we have made an unauthorised use of Calvin's words.

'The meaning of this passage,' he says, 'as a proof of infant damnation, depends on the collocation or omission of "absque remedio" (without remedy) in the translation. As Professor Norton has placed it, following strictly the collocation of the words in the original, the passage teaches that "many nations, with their infant children, are involved in eternal death, and that without remedy;"—and the reviewer, omitting "absque remedio" (without remedy,) though it belongs to the sentence, and controls its meaning so entirely, makes Calvin teach that "the fall of Adam has involved so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death;"—while Allen, by placing "absque remedio" (without remedy) in the translation before "tot gentes" (so many nations,) makes Calvin say, simply what himself and all the Reformers had said, viz. that, independent of any remedy, the fall involved all mankind in eternal death.' pp. 83, 84.

The first thing that strikes us on reading this truly original piece of criticism, is, that Dr Beecher evidently does not understand the difficulty he has himself started. For so far is the meaning of the passage, as a proof of infant damnation, from depending upon the 'collocation or omission of *absque remedio*, "without remedy,"' that it in fact depends upon neither. Erase the words altogether, and what remains, as we have already remarked, will be *sufficient* for our purpose, while, if retained, they may be placed in any part of the sentence, in which they

will not make nonsense, and yet the meaning of the whole will continue the same. So too with respect to Allen's rendering of the words; put it where you will, before *tot gentes*, 'so many nations,' or after *tot gentes*, if it makes any sense, that sense will not be in the slightest degree varied by any difference of position, as any one may satisfy himself, who will be at the pains of making the experiment. The 'collocation' of the words, then, has nothing to do with the objection to our interpretation of the passage which Dr Beecher meant to raise. The whole question, if he had understood it, would have been confined to two points; first, whether it is correct to translate *absque remedio*, by the words 'without remedy;' second, whether *tot gentes* means a part or the whole of mankind. Our learned author seems to think the first point a matter of indifference, provided he can be allowed to put the words in question before *tot gentes*, 'so many nations.' But surely the mere putting of them there, will not make them mean 'independent of any remedy,' if when put in another part of the passage they would mean 'without remedy.' Yet Dr Beecher seems to think so, else why, in every instance in which he gives us the Latin words, does he retain the rendering which we hold to be correct, and say that 'Allen, *by placing* the words "absque remedio," *(without remedy)* in the translation before "tot gentes," (so many nations,) *makes* Calvin say,—that, *independent of any remedy*, the fall involved, &c.?' The truth is, our learned author has taken, or, more probably, has had put into his hands, a weapon of which he plainly does not comprehend the use, and we hope the reader will pardon us, if, in obedience to Dr Beecher's recommendation, we for a moment 'go back to our hornbook,' and attempt to set him right.

So far as *absque remedio* is concerned, the whole dispute relates to the use of the preposition. Should it be rendered by the word 'without,' or by the words 'but for,'—'if it had not been for,'—or 'independent of'? In other words, did Calvin mean to say, that the fall of Adam actually involved many nations with their infant children in eternal death *without* remedy, or, that the fall of Adam would have involved them in eternal death, *but for* a remedy? A pitiful question this, most certainly, and if Dr Beecher had taken counsel of any schoolboy competent to the use of Ainsworth's Thesaurus and Adam's Latin Grammar, rather than of his reluctance to acknowledge an error in respect to the sentiments of Calvin, we should have been spared the humiliation of discussing it, and our readers the tediousness of such trifling. The lad would have turned to

his Grammar, and shown Dr Beecher, that although this preposition is sometimes used in the sense for which he contends, it is there said to be chiefly so used by comic writers, among whom we have not been in the habit of numbering John Calvin, and that in the example given it occurs in construction with a substantive verb. Next, in his Thesaurus, he would have found the correctness of his Grammar confirmed. Every example given by Ainsworth, is rendered as Dr Beecher would have it, it is true; but the examples are all taken from dramatic writers, and the word is in each instance used in connexion with the substantive verb, while Ainsworth adds, in a note, that the force of *absque* by itself is so uncertain, that he prohibits boys the use of it, *except in such constructions*, and thinks that the better classics never used the word at all. In this, however, he is certainly mistaken; for Facciolati gives instances of its use, in the sense of 'without,' by Cicero and others, at the same time adding his authority to that of the Thesaurus and the Grammar, for confining its use, in the sense of 'but for,' &c., to the comic writers, and by them always with the substantive verb.* Nor do we believe that even Dr Beecher's evident familiarity with Latin and Latin works, has helped him to a single instance in which it is employed, with that signification, in any other connexion. We certainly have never met with one, but the instances of its use in the sense of 'without' are innumerable. From Calvin alone we could produce hundreds. Should we proceed no further, then, we should not hesitate to pronounce Allen's translation of *absque remedio*, to be wholly indefensible, having been made with no authority from classical or other usage, but evidently with a design to soften down a rough and offensive part of the Calvinistic system.

But we have still other evidence in favor of our interpretation of the words. Our translation agrees with Professor Norton's, and, in so far as authority can settle the point, we want no better pledge of our correctness than this coincidence. But there is a version by another still, and he did not make it with a view to this controversy. We mean the old English translator, Thomas Norton, to whose work we have once before referred. But, although, according to Dr Beecher, there is 'but one light in the text to redeem it from perversion,' he too has had the hardihood to extinguish it, making the passage in his translation teach

* Thus;—'Absque hoc esset, *but for him.* Plut.—Absque foret te, *but for you.* Id.—Quàm fortunatus cæteris sum rebus, absque unâ hâc foret! *except in this one.* Ter.—Nam absque me esset, et meo præsidio, hic faceret te, &c. *but for me and my protection, he would have made you, &c.* Plaut.'

the same doctrine that it does in ours; for he, just as any one else competent to render it at all would do, translates it thus;—

'Againe I aske: how came it to passe, that the fall of *Adam* did wrap up in eternall death so many nations with their children being infants *without remedie*, but because it so pleased God.'—'It is a terrible decree, I grant.'

Another translation is contained in Nichols's Calvinism and Arminianism compared, part I. p. 19. It gives the sense in the same way, as indeed how would any one think of giving it otherwise?

'What other than the *good pleasure of God* is the cause why the fall of Adam involved in eternal and remediless death whole nations, with their infant offspring? I confess, that it is indeed a *horrible decree*.'

Nor is this all. We have before us a sixth version of this so difficult passage, and that, too, by one, whose 'integrity' may possibly escape Dr Beecher's suspicion, while as a scholar he does not rank so very far below our learned author, that his version of 'an easy passage in John Calvin,' must therefore be wrong, because it differs from the one Dr Beecher has adopted. We refer to Jeremy Taylor, and we shall quote more of his words than are necessary for our present purpose, to show in what estimation, as a Calvinistic authority, he held Dr Twiss, whom Dr Beecher will have to be no authority at all.

'If,' says Jeremy Taylor, '[we are guilty of Adam's sin] by the decree of God, by his choice and constitution, that it should be so, as Mr Calvin and Dr Twiss (that I may name no more for that side) do expressly teach, it follows, that God is the author of our sin; so that I may use Mr Calvin's words; 'How is it, that so many nations with their children should be involved in the fall *without remedy*, but because God would have it so?' And if that be the matter, then to God, as to the cause, must that sin, and *that damnation*, be accounted.'*

Jeremy Taylor, then, as we do, regarded this passage as a proof of Calvin's belief in actual infant damnation, and that without remedy. And since Calvin, after all, did believe in the salvation of a small portion of mankind, including a small portion of infants, Taylor must have thought, as we do, that *tot gentes*, 'so many nations,' means, not, as Dr Beecher contends, all mankind, but those branches only of the human race which are cut off and reserved for the vengeance of eternal fire. But our author would fain show that this interpretation of the passage is completely set aside by Calvin's course of reasoning in the context. We can hardly spare the room, but shall nevertheless transcribe

* Jeremy Taylor's Works, Heber's Edit. Vol. IX. p. 322.

the whole of Dr Beecher's argument on this point, that the public may see what kind of a controvertist we have to deal with. 'Allen,' he tells us, '——makes Calvin say, simply what himself and all the Reformers had said, viz. that, independent of any remedy, the fall involved all mankind in eternal death.' He then proceeds;—

'That this is the true construction, the context does not permit us to doubt; for the subject of discussion was, whether it is anywhere "declared in express terms, that Adam should perish by his defection." Not whether he should actually be damned, but whether he should, by that act, be condemned and exposed justly to eternal death. And, among other reasons to prove that the defection of Adam did expose him to eternal death, by a divine constitution or decree, he alleges the fact, that the loss of salvation by the *whole race*, in consequence of the fall, was by a divine constitution, and not by any natural connexion of cause and effect; and demands, if the effect of Adam's fall upon his posterity was to subject them to eternal death, how can it be supposed that the effect upon himself, should not have been, at least, as fatal to him as to his offspring. "What prevents their acknowledging concerning one man, what they reluctantly grant concerning the whole species. The Scripture proclaims that all men were, in the person of their father, sentenced to eternal death." Then follows, after a few lines, the sentence in question, which is a pressing home of his conclusion, from the foregoing premises: "I ask again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death, but because such was the will of God."—Now, "so many nations," means, undoubtedly, not a few nations, a part of mankind, but is synonymous with what the same premises included above, as no one who examines the passage can fail to see. It is the "whole race," "the whole species," "all men, in the person of their father, sentenced to eternal death," of whom he speaks in the phrase, "so many nations." This being the fact, if you place "absque remedio" in the translation where Professor Norton places it, it represents Calvin as teaching the damnation of the "whole race," "the whole species," "all mankind, and this without remedy," as the consequence of Adam's sin. Will the Professor maintain that Calvin taught the doctrine of the universal actual damnation of all mankind? And yet his collocation of "absque remedio" in the translation, compels him to do so, for the very introduction of the sentence, "Iterum quæro," shows that Calvin urges the same argument now which he had just urged above.' p. 84.

All this, we cannot deny, is fairly enough *reasoned;* but the facts presumed in the case are not as Dr Beecher gives them. He has not only mistaken Calvin's meaning in the particular sentence in question, but he has also, in a manner to us utterly unaccountable, misreported the whole course of Calvin's reasoning in the section from which it is taken, and it is for him to reconcile it with that supreme regard for truth, which ought to be the governing principle in this, as in all other controversies. The very 'subject of discussion' Dr Beecher has misreported in

two respects. It was neither whether it is anywhere 'declared in express terms, that Adam should perish by his defection,' nor 'whether he should, by that act, be condemned and *exposed* justly to eternal death.' Calvin would have found no difficulty in settling these points by scripture quotations, had anybody called them in question. But the title of the chapter to which the disputed passage belongs, is—'A Refutation of those Calumnies with which *this Doctrine* has always been unjustly burdened;' and by 'this doctrine,' is meant the doctrine of absolute predestination by the mere will of God, the doctrine of irrespective decrees. The *general* subject of discussion in the chapter, therefore, was the objections to Calvin's doctrine of absolute predestination, and the *particular* subject discussed at the opening of the seventh section, in which our quotation occurs, is a particular objection to that doctrine. 'They deny,' says Calvin, 'that it is anywhere declared in express terms,' not, as Dr Beecher tells us, 'that Adam should perish by his defection,' or that 'he should, by that act, be condemned and exposed justly to eternal death,' but 'they deny,' to resume Calvin's words, 'that it is anywhere expressly declared, *that it was decreed by God* that Adam should perish by his defection;'—which involves a very different question indeed; namely, not whether Adam should, but *whether it was decreed by God* that he should, perish by his defection. Calvin, of course, concedes this point, or rather evades it by exclaiming, 'As if that same God, of whom the scripture declares, that he does whatsoever he pleases, created the noblest of his creatures with an indeterminate end!'

Having disposed of one objection, Calvin proceeds to another. 'They maintain,' he says, 'that he [Adam] had free will, that he might shape his fortune for himself; but that God *decreed* nothing, except to treat him according to his deserts.' To this second objection, totally distinct from the former one, the reply is, first, 'If so cold a conceit as this is admitted, what will become of God's omnipotence, by which he directs all things according to his secret counsel, which is dependent upon nothing but itself? But [secondly], predestination, whether they will or not, exhibits itself in the posterity [of Adam]. For it did not happen by natural consequence *(naturaliter)*, that all men should lose salvation by the guilt of one parent. What, [then,] prevents their acknowledging of one man, that which they are compelled to grant of the whole human race? For why should they lose labor by evasions? The scripture proclaims that all men were, in the person of one, given over to eternal death.

As this cannot be a natural consequence, it evidently must have proceeded from the wonderful counsel of God. That these pious defenders of the justice of God should be perplexed and hesitate at trifles, and yet overcome great difficulties, is too absurd.' Here both the objection and the answer relate, not to what was to be the effect of Adam's fall upon himself, but to the question whether his fate was the result of an antecedent decree, a divine constitution, or the wonderful counsel of God, instead of being in the order of natural consequences. Calvin's opponents denied the existence of any such decree; 'but,' says he, 'whether they will or not, predestination shows itself in Adam's posterity, for surely it is not according to the natural connexion of cause and effect, that all men should lose salvation by the fault of one parent, and why should they hesitate to acknowledge of one parent, what they are compelled to admit of the whole race? why, after getting over the greater difficulty, should they stop at the less?' Such was the argument, and yet Dr Beecher tells us, that it relates to a totally different point, and that, too, a point which was not here disputed. For Calvin, he says, 'demands, if the effect of Adam's fall upon his posterity was to subject them to eternal death, how can it be supposed that the effect upon himself, should not have been, at least, as fatal to him as to his offspring!' But in fact Calvin demands no such thing. As we have shown, there is not the least agitation of any such a question. That point is all along taken for granted.

Having pressed the arguments we have stated, Calvin, in what next follows, brings still another consideration to set aside the last objection, and establish the doctrine for which he has all along been contending, viz. that the fate of Adam and of mankind is the result of an absolute *decree*, an eternal unconditional predestination according to the secret, inscrutable counsel of God. He had just put to them the question, 'What prevents their acknowledging of one man, what they reluctantly admit of the whole human race?' and he next puts to them, not the same question, as Dr Beecher would persuade us, but quite another; 'I ask again, How has it happened that the fate of Adam has involved so many nations *with their infant children* in eternal death without remedy, *but because it so seemed good* in the sight of God? *Here* their tongues, *on other points* so loquacious, must be struck dumb. It is a horrible decree, I confess.' This sentence, therefore, which is the sentence in question, is not what Dr Beecher calls it, 'a pressing home of Calvin's conclusion from [any] foregoing premises,' but a new set of premises, a new argument for establishing that con-

clusion. Nor does *Iterum quæro*, 'I ask again,'—'show that Calvin urges the same argument now which he had just urged above,' but just the contrary; as is evident by what he immediately subjoins—'*Here* their tongues, *on other points* so loquacious, (*tam dicaces alioqui linguas*) must be struck dumb'—as if he had said, 'Say what they will to all I have before advanced, *this* must be decisive.'

'So many nations,' therefore, does not necessarily mean, as Dr Beecher says, the 'whole race,' 'the whole species,' 'all men, in the person of their father, sentenced to eternal death,' because the phrase is used in quite another connexion, and in an argument and with a reflection upon the fact stated in that argument, which, 'undoubtedly' and absolutely, require it to be taken in its obvious, natural sense, designating, not all nations, but only 'so many nations,' as any one who has ever examined the passage and the context, cannot fail to see. Three times in the few lines that precede this sentence in the section, had Calvin occasion to speak of all mankind, and in each case he uses the appropriate word or phrase. In the first instance it is *omnes*, 'all men,' in the second, *de toto humano genere*, 'of the whole human race,' in the third, *cunctos mortales*, 'all mortals;' and if he had intended again to speak of the whole race, he would unquestionably either have used a fourth synonymous phrase, or repeated one of these. But he had been speaking of *unnatural* things, things so unaccountable on common principles, that resort must be had, for explanation, to something extraordinary, secret, arbitrary, and inscrutable, and the more unaccountable, and the more repugnant to the feelings and judgments of the natural man, the stronger evidences would they be to his purpose. That the whole race should be *exposed* to eternal death by the sin of but one of their number, in itself sufficiently perplexing, was not the most revolting fact within his knowledge, though even this demands the supposition of an arbitrary decree, an 'admirable counsel' of the Almighty, to explain it. But there was another, fitted to fill with horror even him who could be the willing spectator of the last agonies of one whom he had procured to be murdered, and he brings it forth with an air of triumph at having found at last what must strike the gainsayer dumb. For a small portion of the mass of corruption, for a comparatively few of that fallen race which the guilt of its first parent has, by a divine decree, made odious and abominable to God, sovereign mercy has interposed and paid to sovereign justice the price of deliverance. But as to the rest of mankind, the great majority, including whole nations of unbelievers with their infant children, they are left in their lost estate by nature,

wrapped up in eternal death, *without remedy*, to be cast into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. It is a horrible decree, he is compelled to admit, which tears from the mother's breast and precipitates into hell the harmless infant; but then it is a *decree* nevertheless, and is all to the praise of that glorious Calvinistic justice, which might inflict upon the most *innocent* creature, the greatest possible tortures, and which is therefore not to be questioned for consigning these little guilty ones, these 'seeds of sin,' which were odious and abominable in the sight of God before they saw the light of life, to unspeakable torments throughout eternity, where they shall forever burn, yet never be utterly consumed. This is Calvin's doctrine; and to deny the truth of it, or call it cruel, is to blaspheme the God of heaven and of earth; and he who will not detest such blasphemy, says Calvin in another place, 'may curse me at his will. For I cannot expect to escape the abuse of those, who do not spare' the Almighty.

We have above given all which in the section precedes the passage in question, and it puts the meaning of that passage beyond dispute. But Dr Beecher has given for one continued argument on a subject which Calvin does not even touch, that which in fact is a series of arguments upon quite another question. Had he looked into the original, however, he might have secured himself against these egregious mistakes, if mistakes it is not too much charity to suppose them. But then the original would have compelled him to acknowledge the grossness of his error in respect to Calvin's sentiments on the whole subject, and that would not do. Be that as it may, in the margin of the Latin copies of the Institutes, and directly against the section we have been considering, he might have found the proper key to the true meaning of the whole; for there we have these words, intended to indicate the contents of the section,—'The objection *that it was not decreed by God*, that Adam should perish by his defection, is [in this section] done away, *multiplici ratione*, by many reasons,' or, literally, 'by a multiplex argument, deduced from the end of the creation, from the omnipotence, wisdom, and incomprehensible justice of God.' This establishes the correctness of our interpretation of the context, and the indefensibleness of that adopted by Dr Beecher, in a way which it seems to us there is no possibility of evading.

But we are even prepared to give up all we have hitherto said, and yet, from still another source, redeem our promise to *demonstrate*, that our rendering of the passage in dispute is the only one that does justice to Calvin's meaning. All that has hitherto been advanced may go for nothing; for we have still in

our possession evidence that is irresistible without it, and which must of itself settle the point forever. We preferred the course we have taken, however, for the simple reason which we have already given; viz. 'that the public may see what kind of a controvertist we have to deal with.' He writes with an unblushing, uncompromising assurance and dogmatism, of which the force on the public mind has no doubt been well calculated, but the foundations of which, after all, rest upon air, and we should be wanting to the duties imposed upon us by our high vocation, did we suffer them to pass without an exposure of their emptiness. The moral influence upon the community of such unauthorised and overbearing boldness, unsupported, as it is, by the least shadow of right for its pretensions, cannot but be of the very worst character, and it is the duty of honest men to use all honorable means to exhibit it in its true character. It is therefore only that we have chosen to follow our author step by step, rather than to give a merely virtual reply to all he has said, by an independent argument on the main question at issue between him and us.—Let us then see what Dr Beecher tells us in another of his paragraphs, written in the same style of effrontery with all the rest. He is still upon the subject of the disputed passage, and, at the conclusion of his argument upon it, says;—

'It should not be forgotten, that the Institutes were published by Calvin both in Latin and in French, and that Allen had the benefit of both, and that the translation was made while a keen controversy about Calvinism was going on, when any prominent mistake would be sure to be detected. Far be it from me to insinuate a suspicion of the Professor's integrity. Much less of his ability to translate an easy passage in John Calvin. I have only to regret the fact, without being required to account for it, that there should be but one light in the text to redeem it from perversion, and that the Professor and the reviewer should both, though in a different manner, put it out; the one by a wrong collocation of the words in his translation, and the other by omitting them altogether.' p. 85.

And this is from Dr Beecher; and that, too, in relation to a sentence of Latin, which the merest *tyro* would blush to translate in any other way than that which Professor Norton and the reviewer too adopted. No, we have not forgotten that Calvin published his Institutes in French as well as Latin, nor that Allen, as he tells us in his preface, had the benefit of both. But we have yet to be convinced that Allen always made an honest use of his advantages. His translation, it is true, was made when a keen controversy about Calvinism was going on, and when any prominent mistakes would be sure to be detected. They *were* detected; and we do not hesitate to say, that, upon any offensive point of Calvinism, upon any point which Allen

might think 'too orthodox,' as Richard Baxter calls those Calvinists who believe in infant damnation, his language does not do justice to Calvin's as his rendering of the very passage before us, in one instance at least, shows. For his rendering of it is not according to Calvin's French translation, of which we too, to say nothing of Dr Beecher,* have had the 'benefit' as well as he. Calvin's own rendering demonstrates that Allen and Dr Beecher 'have both mistranslated Calvin,' and that the versions by Professor Norton, Jeremy Taylor, Thomas Norton, Nichols, and ourselves, are all correct. We give Calvin's French, with the old orthography, in the following words;—

'Je leur demande derechef, d'où il est aduenu que la cheute d' Adam ait enueloppé auec soy tant de peuples auec leurs enfans *sans aucun remède*, sinon qu' il a pleu ainsi a Dieu.'—'Je confesse que ce decret nous doit espouuanter.'†

Calvin, then, approves our 'collocation,' translation, and punctuation, and in so far as '*absque remedio*,' '*sans aucun remède*,' '*without remedy*,' is concerned, there is an end of the controversy. If a quibble be raised on the ground that Calvin omits in the French, the words answering to *æternæ morti*, 'eternal death,' in the Latin, the reply is, that after cutting off all *remedy* in the case, it was a matter of indifference whether he added the words 'eternal death,' or not, it being as impossible to doubt, what, according to Calvin, was to become of such infants as are *without remedy*, as it is to doubt to what place Dr Beecher would himself consign them, *but for a remedy*.

We intended to have finished this article in our present number; but we have already exceeded our limits, and must defer what we have further to remark to a future opportunity. We shall then expose other mistakes of our author's equally glaring with those relating to Calvin's undoubted belief in infant damnation, produce other unquestionable authorities for charging that doctrine upon Calvinism and Calvinists, and take notice of Dr Beecher's remarkable admissions on the subject, which, to our minds, are as objectionable as the belief he disclaims.

*If, after publishing the Second of the Letters under review, in which he refers to Calvin's French as throwing a light upon the passage in dispute of which Allen 'had the benefit,' Dr Beecher was aware that Calvin had translated it as we do, would he have 'frankly acknowledged his mistake,' in his Third Letter, or at least in some subsequent number of the Spirit of the Pilgrims? That he has not made such an acknowledgment we know. Whether he would have done it in the circumstances above supposed, we dare not undertake for him to say.

† From the edition of 1562, which, of course, 'appeared at Geneva after Calvin's last revision and before his death.'

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

29. Which Society shall you Join, Liberal or Orthodox? A Letter to a Friend. Boston. pp. 24.

THAT is to say, 'Shall you join Liberal society or Orthodox?' though this probably is not what the author meant to say. His spirit and his grammar are much of a piece. He pretends to invite his friend to a most impartial examination of the religious and moral tendencies of the Liberal and Orthodox systems, while he is in reality giving him a most partial and hypocritical account of the assumed superiority of his own side, which, as any one may tell, is the Orthodox. He no doubt thinks that he has baited a very cunning trap. But if anything is caught in it, it must be poor game and small. This Letter is a sort of second edition of the Letter from a Gentleman of Boston to a Clergyman of that City; a variation of the same tune. 'If you should read it,' the author asks, 'before the leading members of the Liberal society, and desire them to circulate it, would they encourage the investigation and the circulation, and be encouraged by it; or would they denounce the letter as a weapon of the Orthodox, which they were requested to wield to their own prostration?' *Weapon! wield! prostration!* Truly then the 'Liberal Society' would be very much to blame to give themselves any trouble in encouraging or discouraging it; and it must be a battle of frogs and mice indeed, in which such a bulrush 'weapon' as this could do any harm or good, by being '*wielded*' on one side or the other.

---

30. As you Sow, so must you Reap. A Sermon, preached at the Ordination of the Rev. Samuel Presbury, over the Second Congregational Society in Northfield, Mass. February 27, 1828. By John Pierpont. Second Edition. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 24.

THIS sermon is an interesting exposition of the text, *He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully shall reap bountifully.* 2 Cor. ix. 6. The general principle which is thus figuratively expressed, is applied by the preacher to the refutation of the common notions concerning election, and the retributions of the divine government both here and hereafter. A note is appended to what is said on the doctrine of election, p. 11, which is so pertinent to the present state of things among us, that we shall quote it entire.

'It *may* be said that we do injustice to our Orthodox brethren, when we either assert or insinuate that they hold the doctrine of absolute or irrespective election—the doctrine that, in electing "some to everlasting life," God had no regard to the works or moral character of the individual elected,—because, it may be said, *that view* of the doctrine of election is not often taken or exhibited by the Calvinistic clergy of the present day. To this I answer:—first, that which I have given is *Calvin's* view of the doctrine of election; and they who call themselves Calvinists, and would give the people to understand that they preach Calvinism, will do well seriously to consider whether, when they have renounced a doctrine of Calvin, they ought not also, so far forth, at least, to renounce his name, and the *credit* that his name gives them: and secondly, I answer, if that *is* said, and said truly, which in this note we suppose may be said, it only proves that, in regard to one of the "five points," if no more, the Orthodox of the present day have deserted the Calvinistic ranks, carrying their colors with them, and that now they stand on Socinian ground and fight the Unitarian battle.* Whether the clergy, when they know that, *in this respect*, they are Socinians, will let others know it, is a question which they will answer for themselves.'

As to the *credit* which is conferred by Calvin's name, we have long wondered what it is, but such as it is, the Orthodox are welcome to it all. He was certainly a man of high genius and deep erudition; and in his character there was much to admire and praise. He was fearless, persevering, zealous, and in a certain way pious; very much such a one as Paul was, before his conversion. His passions were fiery, impetuous, unappeasable. These angry passions invited him to the murder of Servetus—for we cannot and ought not to call it by a softer name; and it is miserable sophistry to try to palliate the crime by talking about the spirit of the age. All the murders and martyrdoms from Abel's downwards, might be excused on the same ground. We would as soon be called by the name of the Grand Inquisitor, as by that of Calvin; and rather too, for Calvin pretended to be a Protestant.

We are pleased that Mr Pierpont has given so much space in his sermon to an exhibition of what we will venture to

* 'Vide Calvini Institutio. Christ. Rel. Lib. III Capp. xxi. xxii. F. Socini Praelectiones Theologicæ, Capp. xiii. xiv.'

say are, in the main, the only rational views with regard to the retributions of a future state. He insists with great force, that they will be awarded according to the principle of the text—the eternal principle of divine government in both worlds, which ordains that every man shall reap that which he has sown, and as much as he has sown, wheat or weeds, bountifully or sparingly. There is so much misrepresentation going about now, concerning the opinions of Unitarians on this subject, that we think Unitarians are loudly required to state distinctly what their opinions are, each man declaring his own without fearing to be called too Heterodox or too Orthodox, or anything else. That their opinions are very generally those contained in the sermon before us, we have little doubt; and we have as little, that the more they are preached the more they will commend themselves to the good sense of the community. The following passage from the sermon cannot be read too carefully.

'It is said that Unitarians are Universalists; many of them professedly, and others secretly, who would be so openly if they dared to profess what they really believe.

'I do not say that the doctrine is not true, that all shall finally be saved. I certainly should rejoice to know that they shall. But I do not find it revealed that they shall, for I find it not revealed that all shall finally obey God's laws. I do not deny that there are Unitarians who are Universalists, any more than our Trinitarian brethren—who bring this charge against us, because they think there is something odious in the name, and something calculated to make the name of Unitarian unpopular,—dare deny that there are Trinitarians who are Universalists. But this may with safety be affirmed, that no man is a Universalist *because* he is a Unitarian. On the contrary, the Unitarian voluntarily retires from the broadest and best ground on which the doctrine of universal salvation can be defended, viz. the infinite satisfaction or atonement for sin, which the Trinitarian finds in the death of Jesus Christ. The argument of the Trinitarian is, that Christ, an infinite being, has, by his death, made an infinite satisfaction for sin:—that it was the very end and object of his death to make such a satisfaction; and, as it is unphilosophical to require a cause that is more than competent to the effect, there never has been, and never can be, a sin for which atonement has not already been made. The debt therefore, of *every* sinner being already paid, there can, in justice, be no further claim upon *any*: and all must be entitled to salvation, for that it has been purchased for all. And, granting the Trinitarian his premises, there is force in his reasoning. But the Unitarian, denying his premises, is not even led *towards* a conclusion so much at war with the analogies of the divine government in this life, with his own experience of the sufferings consequent upon sin here, and with what he believes to be the teachings of the christian scriptures, in regard to the sufferings that shall be consequent upon sin hereafter.' pp. 17-18.

The answer to the charge that Unitarians make light of sin, is as forcible and just as we could wish it. The whole sermon deserves a wide circulation.

---

31. A Greek Lexicon, adapted to the New Testament, with English Definitions. By Samuel C. Loveland. Woodstock, Vermont, 1828. 32mo. pp. 376.

This is, on the whole, a very creditable little book. It is intended for a pocket companion to the Greek Testament, and is well adapted to such a use. Though not much above half the size of the smallest Elzevir, it is complete in all that it pretends to be. Indeed, it performs more than it promises. After the usual manner of American compilations, it loves to be somewhat multifarious, and to leave nothing untold that may seem related to the subject in hand. In a short Appendix, we are presented with the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, an account of the pronunciation of the Romaic or modern Greek, a glance at the Masoretic points, together with a disquisition on the formation of the verbs and verbals in general of the Greek tongue.

The author has availed himself, among other helps, of Jones's Greek and English Lexicon, which we think he is disposed to overvalue, and of Wahl's Lexicon of the New Testament, as translated by Mr Robinson of Andover. He tells us in his preface, that he has 'made it a uniform object to divest the work, as much as possible, of sectarism.' We believe it not only possible, but not very difficult, to do this entirely. A Lexicon, and particularly a miniature one like this, should not attempt to play the commentary; and we could therefore willingly have dispensed with the quotation from Dr Jones, under the word ἱλασμος. In general, however, he has avoided, as he ought, all controversial ground.

---

32. Observations on the Causes and Evils of War; its Unlawfulness; and the Means and Certainty of its Extinction: In a Series of Letters Addressed to a Friend. By Thomas Thrush, late Captain in the Royal Navy. Intended as an Apology for withdrawing himself from the Naval Service. Part III. York. Wilson & Sons. 1827. 8vo. pp. 64.

We have already noticed the two first parts of Captain Thrush's Observations on War. This third part consists of five letters—on the inaccordancy of the pro-

fession of arms with, 1. the principles of natural religion; 2. the decalogue, and the precepts contained in the law and the prophets; 3. the precepts taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles; the fourth and fifth letter being a continuation and conclusion of the subject, particularly in relation to defensive war.

In the first of these letters Captain Thrush considers the inaccordancy of the profession of arms, or rather of the practice of war, with the principles of natural religion. On this branch of his subject, which affords so admirable an opportunity of comparing the ferocity and more than brutal cruelty of war, even in its mildest form, with the benevolence which is exhibited in every work and every device of nature, the author contents himself with a beautiful quotation from Erasmus on the natural endowments of man, a fable from Dr Johnson's Idler, and a second from Dr Franklin. They are all exceedingly apposite, and the one from Johnson was new to us, as it was published only in the original papers of the Idler.

In the next letter, while it is admitted that there is no express prohibition of war in the Old Testament, it is contended that the situation of a soldier in service is almost necessarily inconsistent with his obedience to any one of the commandments of the decalogue, and with doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly before God, the summary of the religion of the Old Testament.

The third letter is devoted to showing that the practice of war is absolutely at variance with the peculiar spirit of the Christian religion, which teaches 'not only the forgiveness of enemies, but the love of them.' Another quotation from Erasmus places this inconsistency in a strong point of view. With what feeling can a christian soldier utter the Lord's prayer, to almost every petition of which war is adverse?

No one who has reflected on the nature of Christianity can doubt that if men could all be persuaded to act, individually and as parts of society, entirely in conformity with the requisitions of the gospel, a state of happiness and prosperity would prevail on earth with which the brightest pictures in history would bear no comparison. The doubt is with most persons, whether such an influence will ever be exercised by the divine spirit of Christianity over the selfish and ambitious principles of the human heart. Speaking as philosophers only—taking our lesson from the page of history, and reflecting on the character of this religion as to its tendency to affect the conduct and motives of men, we may doubt, but with our doubt there is some reason for hope. But as Christians, believing in the divine origin of this religion and in its perfect adaptation to the wants and weakness of man, as believers in a Providence controlling all, and bringing praise even out of the wrath of man, our hope becomes confidence.

The argument of the next letter is directed particularly against defensive war. In this we cannot think that there is wisdom. All will be accomplished which the religion of Christ requires, if offensive wars are brought to an end. And, until a common tribunal of nations shall be established, to determine in all cases of national offence against the great common good, each individual nation must, as far as it can, vindicate its own rights, and national liberty and national existance be considered legitimate objects of defence; as, before the erection of civil tribunals, the life and freedom of individuals must have been of individual defence. We do not strengthen our cause by pushing it to extremes. Universal peace may prevail, and the right of defence be not affected. Perfectly wise policy and the divine philanthropy of the gospel, will be found to concur in forbidding offensive war, without requiring in national, any more than in private relations, that offenders against justice should go unpunished.

In the last letter the same doctrine of non-resistance is maintained and further extended; and though we cannot fully assent to it, without admitting a principle, which, literally acted upon, would go far to take away the sword and the balance of justice, we cannot but respect the candour and sincerity with which the argument is pursued.

---

33. The School or Lessons in Morals. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. Boston. Cottons & Barnard. 1827-8. 18mo.

We make no apology for so often noticing books written for children. When well executed, we do not know of any which, on many accounts, better deserve attention. The series before us is intended chiefly for children in the humbler walks of life, and is well adapted to their use. The manners, conversations,

and incidents, without having any taint of coarseness or vulgarity, seem faithful representations from humble life. The style is very easy and simple, and the stories are lively and well told. Every piece appears to be intended to produce a distinct moral impression. And though the virtue and religion which are taught, are pure and elevated, there is not, perhaps, a single instance of exaggerated sentiment, or of anything calculated to give the laboring classes false views of their situation in society. On the contrary, children are represented as performing their common duties without expecting or receiving extraordinary rewards.

---

34. A Sermon Preached before the Annual Convention of the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, in Boston, May 29, 1828. By Edward Griffin, D. D., President of Williams College. Boston. T. R. Marvin. 1828. 8vo. pp. 24.

We have read this Sermon with unmingled admiration; admiration that a gentleman who puts D. D. at the end of his name, who is President of a College, and was once a Professor of Rhetoric, should have ventured to pronounce so remarkable a production before the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts. In the annual discourse before the Convention, we do not usually look for 'fine speculations' or 'flights of eloquence,' but we do always expect good sense, good judgment, and good taste. We are obliged to say, that in the present instance we have sought for these qualities in vain. In their stead we have found grossness and inaccuracy of language, extravagance in thought, and downright contradiction in terms. We know that we use plain language; but when a person sees fit to print a discourse abounding with defects and errors of the kind just mentioned, we hold it to be the province of a just and impartial criticism to let the world know of them. The charges that we have made we are prepared to substantiate by quoting page, line, and word. Let him that doubts the accuracy or fairness of our description, read the Sermon, and he will find that the terms applied to it are not too strong. As a specimen of the confusion of the Doctor's ideas, and his downright contradictions, we quote the following passages; '*ex pede Herculem.*'

'The Sanctifier of the world is absolutely promised to prayer;—But it is no ordinary prayer. It is the Holy Ghost himself praying in the heart of the Christian.' p. 10.

That is, according to the trinitarian scheme, God the Holy Ghost prays to God the Father to send God the Holy Ghost. The absurdity and nonsense of this statement, it should be remembered, attach not to us, but to the author.

We have room but for one more specimen.

'This world belongs to Christ. It was "created *by* him and *for* him;" and he has *purchased* it *since* and received it for the residence of his Church,—for the abode of men strung up to a high instrumentality in the service of his kingdom.' p. 18.

Thus the world, according to Dr Griffin, is the property of Christ by a double title, by creation and by purchase. For ourselves, we should hold that the mere fact of his having created the world entitled him to possession; and to talk of purchasing one's own property, is one of those mysteries in language and sense which we utterly despair of ever being able to fathom. And then the world is received, by its creator and purchaser, for the 'abode of men *strung up!*' We have done.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Mission at Calcutta.—'Agreeably to public announcement, a General Meeting of the Friends and Supporters of Unitarian Christianity in Calcutta, was held at the Hurkaru Public Rooms, on Sunday evening, the 30th ultimo [Dec. 1827]. After an appropriate prayer by the Rev. W. Adam, Theodore Dickens, Esq. was called to the chair.

'The Chairman introduced the object of the meeting by briefly stating the circumstances under which the Calcutta Unitarian Committee was formed in 1821, the small number of individuals that originally composed it, the difficulties with which they had to contend, and the increasing interest which has begun to be felt in their labors both in India, in

England, and in America. He remarked that all who were present, in proportion as their minds were interested in the promotion of pure and rational religion, must feel that their nature was elevated and improved, and although he saw several around him better qualified than himself to preside at this meeting, yet he was grateful for the honor which was done him, and yielded to none in the great importance which he attached to the objects of the Committee and in his anxious desire to extend the blessings of Unitarian Christianity, to those who were prejudiced against its principles or ignorant of its truths. He then called upon Mr Adam, the Secretary, to read the Report; but as it was too long for perusal at one time, only extracts were read, the whole being intended for publication.

'The design of the Report was stated to be, to communicate information to Unitarian Christians in different parts of the world, respecting what has been done, what is doing, and what is proposed to be done, for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity in India. The first endeavour of the Committee after its institution, was to secure foreign cooperation; in which they have succeeded to a considerable extent, both American and English Unitarians having contributed liberally to aid them in their labors. The first object accomplished by their united means, has been the employment of a Unitarian Missionary, and another object for the attainment of which a public subscription has been opened, is the erection of a Chapel for English worship in Calcutta. The latter object was especially urged in the Report as essential to give full efficiency to the Mission. After detailing the proceedings and intentions of the Committee for the diffusion of religion and knowledge by means of Lectures to the Natives, Schools, Tracts, &c. a summary view was given of the state of the Funds which were classed under three separate heads, the Permanent Fund amounting to Sa. Rs. 25,000, the interest of which is applied to the support of a Missionary; the Chapel Fund, having a cash balance of about Sa. Rs. 9,000 in its favour, after the purchase of ground for 12,000 Rs., besides Calcutta subscriptions still remaining unpaid to the amount of 5 or 6000 Rs.; and the General Fund, or Fund for Contingent Expenses, which consists of annual, quarterly, and monthly subscriptions, and donations amounting to 160 Rs. per month. Adverting to the defective organization of the Committee, occasioned by the peculiar circumstances in which it had taken its origin, the gentlemen composing it recommended a more complete organization under a new and more comprehensive name, that of the British Indian Unitarian Association, and with that view proposed a series of Resolutions for the consideration of the meeting.

'The first Resolution was moved by Baboo Durakanath Thakoor and seconded by Mr Smith;—That this meeting does hereby form itself into a Society which shall be called the British Indian Unitarian Association, having the same objects and principles as the Calcutta Unitarian Committee, assuming all the responsibilities of that Committee, and receiving their rights, titles, powers, and properties.

'The second Resolution was moved by Baboo Tarachund Chuckruburtee and seconded by Mr Sutherland;—That the members of the Calcutta Unitarian Committee be requested to act as the Committee of the British Indian Unitarian Association for the ensuing year, under the rules and regulations framed by the Calcutta Unitarian Committee for itself, with power to supply vacancies in their own number; and that the Committee be requested to frame and submit to the next Annual Meeting such further regulations as may appear necessary to give efficiency to the Association.

'Mr Sutherland seconded this Resolution. He observed that the talents and worth of the gentlemen nominated, and the esteem in which they were universally held in this Society, rendered it unnecessary for him to say anything in favour of such a nomination. He believed that when a Unitarian Chapel should be erected in Calcutta it would be numerously and respectably attended, and that the principles of Unitarian Christianity would be the only effectual means of dissipating that thick cloud of superstition which has so long hung over this land. He hoped he might observe without offence to any one present (alluding to the Native gentlemen) that in no country in the world, was the spread of rational religion an object of more interest to the philanthropist than in British India. Yet let it not be supposed that in India alone superstition exerted its debasing influence. Instances of it were of fre-

quent occurrence in countries esteemed infinitely more enlightened, and he hoped he might be excused for mentioning one example of it which had recently come to his knowledge. Because in his mortal agonies the late Mr Canning, whose loss Britain now deplores—the brightest star in the galaxy of talent that ever adorned the office of Premier, had no minister of religion in his chamber, it was alleged that he was an Atheist! A more revolting example of bigotry was never recorded.

'Mr Sutherland concluded by expressing his opinion that within the past year, more especially, the numbers of those disposed to listen to the doctrines of Unitarianism had greatly increased, and his conviction that the labors of the Association would be attended with success.

'The third Resolution was moved by Mr Adam and seconded by Mr Gordon; That this meeting views with deep interest the combined exertions of English and American Unitarians to establish a Mission in this country, pledges itself to zealous and persevering cooperation with them, confides in their continued sympathy and aid in the prosecution of the object, and earnestly solicits the assistance and countenance of such Unitarians both in Europe and America as have hitherto withheld their support.

'Mr Adam in moving the Resolution pointed out the limited resources of the English and American Unitarians, the number and importance of their domestic institutions, and the proof of deep interest in a Foreign Mission which was furnished by the very liberal and disinterested pecuniary aid, which, under these circumstances, they had afforded to the Calcutta Unitarian Committee. To show the extent of the interest felt in this object, he enumerated the various places in England and Scotland from which subscriptions in aid of the Calcutta Mission had been derived. He also read a letter which he had just received from Baboo Prusunnu Comar Tagore, expressing that gentleman's regret, that he was prevented by serious indisposition from being present, and stating that he was and should continue to be a warm friend to the cause of liberal religion.

'The fourth Resolution was moved by Rammohun Roy and seconded by Mr Tate; That this meeting invites all Unitarians, whether Christian or Hindoo, in every part of India, to form themselves into Associations auxiliary to the British Indian Unitarian Association, and to place themselves in communication with the Secretary of that Association.

'We regretted to observe that Rammohun Roy was laboring under severe bodily indisposition at the time. We understand, that he has since, in some measure, recovered.—

'At one of the intervals between the seconding of one Resolution and the moving of another, several questions were asked by a gentleman (Mr Douglas) respecting the rate of subscription, the constitution of the Committee, the disposal of the funds, &c., which were answered by the Chairman apparently to the perfect satisfaction of the meeting.

'The Chairman again addressed the meeting, congratulating those who were present on the unanimity which had attended the proceedings of the evening, and on the encouragement which they afforded to the friends of Unitarian Christianity in Calcutta to proceed, with firmness and zeal, in the prosecution of the high and important purposes for which they were united.

'The meeting was then closed by a short extempore prayer by Mr Adam.

'We observed that a distinguished foreign traveller, Count Vidua, was present, besides several other gentlemen of respectability. The auditors appeared to be much interested in the proceedings.'

Bengal Hurkaru and Chronicle.

American Unitarian Association.—The third anniversary of this Association, was celebrated in Boston, on the twentyseventh of May, 1828. The meeting for business was held in the Vestry, in Berry Street, at 6 o'clock, P. M. The proceedings at the last annual meeting were read, and a Report offered by the Executive Committee, from which it appeared, that circumstances had prevented the attendance of messengers from this Association, at the United States Christian Conference, held last Sept'r tho' several gentlemen had been requested to perform this service. By the Treasurer's Statement of Receipts and Expenditures, it appeared that the total amount of receipts the past year was $4249.53, and the amount of expenditures for the same period, $2911.90, leaving a balance on the 27th of May, 1828, of $1537.63.

An amendment of the Constitution proposed by a vote of the last year, was then considered and accepted, the effect of which is, to add to the Execu-

tive Committee a Secretary for Foreign Correspondence.

The Officers of the last year were all unanimously reelected, and the Rev. John G. Palfrey, was unanimously chosen Foreign Secretary.

From the meeting for business the Association adjourned to the Federal Street Church. After prayers had been offered by the Rev. Dr Porter of Roxbury, the Executive Committee's Third Annual Report was read by their Secretary, the Rev. Mr Gannett, of Boston. The sum total of tracts issued during the past year has been 74,300. The number published since the commencement of the Society's operations has been about 143,000, none of which, with two exceptions, contain less than 12 pages, and most of which are much larger. A part of the society's funds have, at repeated solicitations, been appropriated to the support of missionary labors, with manifest advantage to their cause. Settled clergymen have been employed in this way, and always with injunctions to avoid whatever might disturb the peace of parishes or churches. Honorable mention was made of the services of the Minister at Large in Boston.

Notice was next taken of the encouragement the Committee had received, from their correspondence with various parts of the country, to believe that there is a general and a steady progress of christian light. At no time has a scriptural faith been more prevalent, more cordially embraced, more earnestly maintained, or more surely extending itself throughout the country than at the present. Especially is this true of the principles of religious liberty and christian equality, and the result of all is, that the Unitarian doctrines are diffusing themselves, and that attempts to enslave men to creeds, or deprive them of their rights as christian citizens, will meet with but partial, if any success. 'From the British and Foreign Unitarian Association,' said the Committee, 'we have received renewed expressions of sympathy; and we cannot but rejoice with them in the prospect of a partial removal of those civil disabilities, which have so long been employed to depress the English Dissenter below his due rank in society. We hail the first sound of the falling shackles, though they have been worn rather as a badge of distinction than an impediment to activity. It is grateful, as it signifies a change of public sentiment, and as it is a proof that injustice and error cannot always maintain their power. We hope that we shall have yet more occasion to rejoice with our brethren, who dwell in the home of our ancestors, as they obtain a full restoration of their civil and religious rights.'

Among the auspicious circumstances at home the Report noticed the organization of the Young Men's Book and Pamphlet Society, and of the Boston Sunday School Society, and the commencement of the Unitarian Advocate, the Christian Teacher's Manual, the Liberal Preacher, and the Unitarian, and the publication of several works intended to illustrate the sacred scriptures, and to make the English reader better acquainted with their true character. Of the wants of the Unitarian community, none has been more evident or more sensibly felt than that of candidates for the ministry. 'The demand for preachers,' we are told, 'greatly exceeds the ability of the School in Cambridge, to which the Unitarian churches almost invariably look for a supply. It seems necessary, that the resources of this School should be enlarged, or that some other means should be adopted, to satisfy the continually growing necessities of the community.'

The state of Unitarian Societies at the South was next adverted to, and the Report closed with a respectful tribute to the memory of two distinguished members of our demomination, lately deceased, the Rev. Robert Little of Washington, and the Hon. Samuel Howe of Northampton.

The Hon. Judge Story of Salem then moved the acceptance of the Report, which was seconded by Joseph May, Esq. of Boston. The Rev. Mr Ware of Boston expressed a hope that the vote would not pass without a word of encouragement to the Committee of which he was a member. The Rev. Dr Channing then rose, and in an address of considerable length, enumerated the auspicious circumstances under which Unitarianism had taken its rise in this country, and endeavoured to impress upon its friends a conviction of the high responsibilities the possession of its truths imposed. Though the rapid progress of liberal opinions was itself encouraging, the circumstances under which that progress had been made were much more so. It is not the result of great efforts, nor of appeals to the passions or prejudices of men; but has been silently effected by sober and pacific arguments, addressed to the understandings of an enlightened people, by the diffusion of

general information, by improvements in education, and in general by that gradual enlargement of the common mind, which by embracing truth upon one subject is expanded for the reception of truth upon another. But not only are we encouraged by thinking of the manner how, but the place where this has been effected. It has taken place in the most enlightened and moral part of the nation, which has always been preeminently distinguished by its love of freedom, and is now justly claiming the high distinction of being the cradle of the religious, as well as of the civil liberties of the country. It took the lead in our political, and is now doing the same in our religious revolution. The blessings of the former have extended themselves to the humblest members of our community, and it was gratifying to see evidence that those of the latter are doing, and fitted to do, the same. The labors of the Unitarian Minister at Large have conclusively shown the adaptation of our religious views to the wants of the poor and ignorant, a circumstance of peculiar encouragement. There was encouragement too, in the very circumstances of this meeting. It was cheering to see how many were not ashamed to assemble on such an occasion, and for such purposes. The speaker then turned from what had been doing, to what still remained to be done. We have no monopoly of light, and it is our duty to impart it to others. The truths we hold are great truths, and the obligation is correspondingly imperative to extend them.

Judge Story then called the attention of the meeting to another and a most important subject, the discussion of which, he said, was loudly called for by the circumstances in which we of the present day stand. He referred to the attempts of late set on foot to establish in the state and nation an ecclesiastical power, from which, if successful, we shall have everything to fear. Gentlemen might say there is no danger, but on the other hand no liberty is long enjoyed which is not watched. Prevention is better than remedy. We live in critical times, and it might be asked whether we were safe even here, where religious liberty is secured to us by our Constitution and by the attachments of a long series of years to our free institutions. The various methods adopted to build up this ecclesiastical tyranny were enumerated. We are to have funds for the perpetual propagation of certain articles of faith. Human reason is vilified, that the people may with less feeling of humiliation submit to the yoke in preparation. We are to have slavery of mind as well as of property. Propery is to be tied to creeds and creeds to property. The history of these measures in other countries should put us on our guard against them in this. The authority of reason in matters of religion was ably vindicated, and a masterly argument was instituted against the 'trust deeds' lately invented, and an analysis given of that of Hanover Church in particular, showing that it was an instrument which was intended to enslave the minds and lock up the property of the people, in a manner which it was as unjustifiable in the one party to enforce, as degrading in the other to submit to. The various topics handled were treated with great power and with great effect, and we hope hereafter to do better justice to the whole address. After Judge Story's remarks, the question recurred on the acceptance of the Report—and it was passed in the affirmative.

The Rev. Dr Thayer, of Lancaster, next made some pertinent observations introductory to the following resolution; '*Resolved*, That the state of religious sentiment, and the progress of religious inquiry, are such as to afford encouragement to the friends of truth.' He was seconded by Mr F. A. Farley, of Boston, and the resolution was adopted.

The Rev. Mr May of Brooklyn, Con. proposed a resolution in these words; '*Resolved*, That the American Unitarian Association highly disapprove the spirit of acrimony and misrepresentation, which is too often discovered in the religious publications of the day.' Mr May, in the course of his remarks, noticed the promising aspect of things in the State of Connecticut, which in many parts shows evident signs of an approaching emancipation from consociations and unscriptural creeds, which it is the duty of Unitarians to do everything to promote and nothing to retard. We regret, however, that he did not give some more particular notice of the facts upon which his resolution was grounded. He was ably seconded by the Rev. Mr Sullivan of Keene, N. H. who stated that the same things were true of his section of the country, and that the acrimony and misrepresentation complained of, were chargeable more upon the clergy than the people, among whom the spirit of inquiry was busily at work, and fast producing its salutary effects, in purifying their faith from old corruptions and loos-

ening their minds from a blind submission to ecclesiastical dictators. The resolution was adopted.

S. Higginson, jr. Esq., of Cambridge, then presented the following resolution, which he supported by a statement of facts. '*Resolved*, That the increasing demand for Unitarian preachers, calls for an increase of the means by which this demand may be supplied.' The Rev. Mr Hall of Northampton, in an animated address, in which he spoke of the efforts required of Unitarians for the diffusion of their faith, seconded the resolution, and it was passed.

Judge Story moved, that the Report be printed, and circulated as a tract, which was voted. The Ascription, beginning, 'From all who dwell below the skies,' was then sung by the assembly standing, after which the meeting was adjourned *sine die*.

Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers.—The annual meeting of this Convention, was held in the Court House, in Boston, on Wednesday and Thursday, May 28th and 29th. No business of much importance was transacted, except that which regularly comes before the meeting, in relation to the charity for which the Convention was instituted. The committee to whom last year was referred the question of measures to be adopted respecting the dinner, which has usually been given to the ministers of the State by the societies of Boston, were not ready to report, in consequence of Professor Stuart's non-attendance. He had given his written views on the subject, however, but they were not communicated to the Convention. Some conversation ensued on a proposition for an indefinite postponement of the whole subject, in which the origin and history of the custom were detailed. The ground taken by the majority was, that it was indelicate to interfere in the premises. This was opposed, principally, by the Rev. Mr Wisner, an Orthodox minister of Boston, who was the most active debater on that side both last year and this. He could see no impoliteness in giving notice to his host that he begged he would not be at the expense of an entertainment in future, which has hitherto been very gratefully received and properly estimated, but which is now a piece of extravagance, and ought, for temperance and example's sake, to be discontinued. The Rev. Mr Hildreth, however, was of a different opinion, and thought the more proper course was to leave it discretionary with the host to provide or not provide, and equally discretionary with the individual guests, to accept or not accept the proffered hospitality, asking no questions for conscience's sake. The latter view of the subject prevailed, as being more consistent with the rules of good breeding, and so the proposition for indefinite postponement was carried.

The choice of preacher was next made, and by long established rules it should have fallen upon a Unitarian. But the Orthodox seemed determined that the Liberal party shall not monopolize the credit of being the only reformers of abuses, and, leaving the reformation of the faith to them, took to themselves that of other matters, and chose the Rev. President Humphreys by a majority of thirtyfive votes. On Thursday, the Convention Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Dr Griffin. We have already spoken of the character of his performance in our Notices of Recent Publications.

Ordination at Baltimore.—On Wednesday, the 23d of April, the Rev. Geo. W. Burnap of the Theological School in Cambridge, was ordained as the pastor of the First Independent Church, in Baltimore, formerly under the charge of the Rev. Mr Sparks. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Furness, of Philadelphia; Reading of the Scriptures, by the Rev. Mr Briggs, of Lexington; Sermon, by the Rev. James Walker, of Charlestown; Ordaining Prayer, by the Rev. Dr Porter, of Roxbury; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Ripley, of Concord; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Stetson, of Medford; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Dr Bancroft, of Worcester; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Ware, of New York.

Installation in Boston.—On Wednesday, May 21st, the Rev. Mellish Irving Motte was installed as Pastor of the South Congregational Society in Boston. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Gannett; Selections from Scripture, by the Rev. Mr Ripley; Sermon by the Rev. Dr Channing; Prayer of Installation, by the Rev. Dr Ware, Professor of Divinity in Harvard University; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Harris, of Dorchester; Fellowship of the Churches, by the Rev. Mr Upham, of Salem; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Mr Greenwood; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. H. Ware, jr.

Ordination at Dennis.—The ordination of the Rev. Daniel Mansfield Stearns, as Pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in North Dennis, took place on Wednesday, May 14th. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Hersey, of East Barnstable; Sermon, by the Rev. Dr Lowell, of Boston; Consecrating Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Shaw, of Eastham; Charge, by the Rev. Mr Simpkins, of Brewster; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Stearns, of Stoughton; Address to the Church and Society, and Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Stone, of Provincetown.

Ordination at Brighton.—On Wednesday, June 4th, the Rev. Daniel Austin, from the Theological School in Cambridge, was ordained Pastor of the First Congregational Society in Brighton. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr White, of Littleton; Selections from Scripture, by the Rev. Mr Francis, of Watertown; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Stetson, of Medford; Ordaining Prayer, by the Rev. Dr Ware, of Harvard University; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Ripley, of Concord; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Burton, of East Cambridge; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Mr Field, of Weston; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Whitman, of Waltham.

Ordination at New York.—On Thursday, June 19th, the Rev. William Parsons Lunt, was ordained as Pastor of the Second Congregational Unitarian Society in the city of New York. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Colman, of Salem; Selections from the Scriptures, by the Rev. Mr Pierpont, of Boston; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Greenwood, of Boston; Prayer of Ordination, by the Rev. Dr Kendall, of Plymouth; Charge, by the Rev. Mr Frothingham, of Boston; Right Hand of Fellowship, and Address to the Society, by the Rev. William Ware, of New York; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Parkman, of Boston

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

Russia.—On the 27th of April, the emperor of Russia made a formal declaration of war against the Ottoman Porte, and it is understood that about the same date the Russian army on the Pruth, passed that river, and entered the Turkish territories. No particular account of the operations of the army has yet reached us. The declaration enumerates various causes of complaint against Turkey for the last sixteen years, the principal of which are the violation of the convention of Akerman, and other treaties, the closing of the Bosphorus against the Russian trade on the Black Sea, the interference with the negotiations for peace between Russia and Persia, and the hostile declarations in the Turkish manifesto of the 12th of January. The emperor disavows any ambitious designs, and declares that countries and nations enough already obey the laws of Russia, and cares enough are united with the extent of her dominion; but that the war being brought on by Turkey, she must bear the burden of making good all the expenses caused by it, and the losses sustained by Russian subjects. The objects of the war are to secure the observance of the treaties which the Porte considers as no longer existing, entire liberty, for the future, of commerce in the Black Sea, and of navigation of the Bosphorus. He declares that although he is at war with the Porte for reasons which are independent of the convention of July 6, 1827, with Great Britain and France, he will not depart from the stipulations of that convention. The duties which it imposed upon Russia he says will be strictly observed, and the Allies will find her always ready to act in concert with them, in the execution of that treaty, and always zealous to cooperate in a work which is recommended by religion, and all the feelings which do honor to humanity. The declaration concludes by saying that the emperor will not lay down his arms till he has obtained the results stated in the declaration; and that he expects them from the benedictions of Him, to whom justice, and a pure conscience have never yet appealed in vain.

It appears from various declarations from members of the British and French

governments, that an entire harmony subsists between Russia and the other Allied powers. The fleets of the three powers, which were disabled in the battle of Navarino, have been repaired, and are supposed to be employed in the waters of the Archipelago, for enforcing the convention of July 6. A body of French troops, prepared for foreign service, and a large naval armament with transports for the conveyance of troops, was lately assembled at Toulon and Marseilles, which was probably destined for the Morea. But it seems the Allied powers have resolved on a different course, and the armament has been dispersed, and the troops marched to their respective cantonments. The war between France and Algiers still continues.

GREECE.—Count Capo d'Istria has arrived in Greece, where he was received with enthusiasm by all parties. He has organized a provisional government, and has used great efforts to introduce order and efficiency into the different departments of the administration. In aid of the finances he has established a bank, and invited men of property in the country to invest their funds in it. He has endeavoured to introduce a system of organization into the army, and has taken decisive measures for the suppression of piracy. The attempt of the Greeks to obtain possession of the island of Scio proved unsuccessful. After having obtained the command of the whole island except the castle, and having held that fortress in a state of seige for several weeks, a large reinforcement of Turkish troops arrived from the Asiatic coast, under the protection of a fleet from the Dardanelles, in consequence of which they were obliged to retreat to the western part of the island, and were soon after taken off by Greek and French vessels.

GREAT BRITAIN.—The ministry of which the Duke of Wellington is the head, appears to be firmly established, notwithstanding the secession of some of its members, and they seem disposed to retain their power, by adopting a course of liberal policy, and by such reforms as are strongly called for by the public sentiment. A bill has passed both houses of parliament, by the support of the ministry, and has received the Royal assent, for the repeal of the corporation and test acts, and substituting for the sacramental tests which were required to be taken as a qualification for office, merely a declaration that no privilege, power, or influence which may be derived from the office, shall be made use of to overthrow or disturb the present church establishment. A resolution, proposing a committee of inquiry into the Catholic claims, passed the house of commons, after a debate of three days, by a majority of six votes, in a very full house, viz. yeas, 272; nays, 266. After the adoption of this resolution, the house of lords were invited to a conference for the purpose of communicating the resolution, and asking their concurrence. The conference was agreed to, and five conferees were appointed on the part of each house to meet on a future day, named by the house of lords. This form of proceeding, though not without precedent, is quite unusual in the British parliament. At the conference, Sir Francis Burdett, on the part of the house of commons, submitted the following resolution, which was reported to the lords, and the 9th of June was appointed for taking it into consideration; viz.—That it is expedient to consider the laws affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Great Britain and Ireland, with a view to such final and conciliatory adjustments as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, to the stability of the Protestant Establishment, and to the general satisfaction and concord of all classes of his Majesty's subjects.

PORTUGAL.—Don Pedro, emperor of Brazil, on the 3d of March last, by a public decree completed his abdication of the crown of Portugal, in favor of his daughter, Donna Maria, who is recognised as queen of Portugal, by the constitutional charter, given to Portugal by Don Pedro, on the death of the late king. Don Miguel, the brother of the emperor of Brazil, and appointed by him regent of Portugal, during the minority of Donna Maria, has shown little disposition to regard the obligations of the constitution, but on the contrary seems inclined to assume an absolute authority, in his own right, as successor to his father. The friends of the constitution have been disgraced, the advocates of absolute authority promoted, and in many of the principal towns, except Lisbon and Oporto, Don Miguel has been openly proclaimed king,

without opposition. The British troops have been withdrawn from Portugal, and it is reported that all the foreign ambassadors, accredited at the court of the regent, have received orders from their governments to give notice of the termination of their functions, in case he should carry into effect the designs he is supposed to meditate, of having himself declared king, by a convocation of the three estates of the kingdom.

SOUTH AMERICA.—The information from the new States of the South, is not of a very agreeable character. Accounts have reached us from Brazil, that negociations were in train, for a peace between that country and Buenos Ayres, on a basis which was likely to be successful, viz. the recognition of the independence of the country about which the two parties have been contending. In the mean time the finances of both the belligerent parties are in a poor state, particularly of the Buenos Ayreans, and what was worse for the latter country, their government is in a state of the greatest disorganization. The republic of Colombia is in hardly a better state. The government appears to be in a state of abeyance. The national convention, at the date of the last information from that country, was still in session, deliberating on the mode of remedying the evils of the times, and on amendments of the constitution, which should restore efficiency to the government. Bolivar was at Bogota, and had addressed a message to the convention, in which he resigned his office as president of the republic. He represents the government as entirely prostrated, and insubordination everywhere prevalent, and recommends a new distribution of power, in which there shall be a strong executive, and in which the legislative body shall have less control. If the reports which have reached us can be depended on, there can be little doubt that Bolivar will be constituted Dictator, and the forms of his administration will be regulated at his pleasure.

CENTRAL AMERICA.—The condition of this government is still worse than that of Colombia. Mr Rochester, appointed Charge d'Affaires of our own government, to reside at Guatemala, lately proceeded as far as Omoa, for the purpose of entering on the duties of his appointment, but he there received such information of the distracted state of the country, as induced him to return to the United States. The late president of the union, Arce, had resigned. Two parties called the Guatemalians or Centralists, and the St Salvadorians or Liberalists, were at open war with each other. Honduras, and Porto Rico, were in a state of tranquillity. Mr Rochester left Omoa May 17th.

MEXICO.—The state of this country has undergone no improvement, but is rather growing worse. No effectual measures have been taken for sustaining the credit of the government in Europe, and the dividends on the large loans obtained in London remain unpaid. The Mexican stocks, as well as those of the other new American States, are consequently at a very low ebb in the European markets. Measures of still further severity against the Spaniards in Mexico, have been adopted, which have an unfavorable effect on the trade of the country.

UNITED STATES.—The Congress of the United States closed its annual session on the 26th of May. The measures of the greatest public interest adopted during the session, were,an act increasing the duties on certain articles of foreign manufacture, designed for the promotion of domestic manufactures; an act for the relief of the surviving officers and soldiers of the Revolution; an act appropriating a million of dollars in aid of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal; and an act making an appropriation for the construction of a break-water at the mouth of Delaware river. The first of these measures was contested with warmth in both houses of Congress, and the opinions of the public are much divided on the question of its justice and expediency. A large number of private bills were passed, by which the just claims of individuals, who had long sought redress in vain, have been acknowledged and liquidated.

A convention between this country and Great Britain, has been recently published, by which the form of proceeding is arranged, for preparing the question respecting the boundary line between Maine and New Brunswick, to be submitted to the arbitration of a third power. Mr Albert Gallatin of Pennsylvania, and Judge Preble of Maine, have been appointed commissioners on the part of our government, to prepare the statement of our claim, for this arbitration.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in Groton, March 23d, 1828, Mrs Jane, wife of Rev. Charles Robinson, and only daughter of Stewart J. Park, Esq. aged 21.

The character of Mrs Robinson was one of uncommon amiableness. To strong good sense, and a sound, discriminating judgment, she united a high degree of mental cultivation and discipline. But it was the qualities of her heart, her kind and generous feelings, her meek and lovely temper, and the mildness and gentleness of her manners, that rendered her an object of peculiar interest and affection to all who knew her. Her character was a perfectly natural one. She had nothing about her that savoured of vanity or affectation. There was a simplicity and sincerity in her whole deportment, in all she said and did, that corresponded to, and evinced the purity and rectitude of her feelings. She was remarkably devoid of selfishness. She lived indeed for others; and it was her delight to witness, and as far as she was able, to promote the happiness of all within her influence. Benevolence was a prominent trait in her disposition, and it shone out in all her actions. She always paid a most delicate regard to the feelings of others; and she never allowed herself to make, nor, if she could avoid it, to *hear*, remarks to the disadvantage of others. The poor and destitute found in her a zealous friend and advocate; and so deeply were her feelings interested in their behalf, that she enjoined it upon her friends, as one of her dying requests, to be mindful of their claims, and to minister to their wants, especially in the rigorous season of the year. She was ever a counsellor of good and a prompter to duty, and in her early removal from a situation, in which she was fitted to be eminently useful, her friends feel that they mourn a loss which can never be repaired.

A mind like Mrs Robinson's was naturally predisposed to the reception of religious impressions. Piety, with her, was almost a native impulse, springing from the sublime and affecting relations, which she felt she sustained to the Father of Spirits. Her feelings towards her Maker were peculiarly filial. She delighted to think of him and speak of him as her Father; and her obedience and resignation seemed to spring immediately from a principle of love. She was a Christian in the best sense of the word; and exemplified in her temper and life, those mild and amiable virtues which the gospel values most highly. It is upon this part of her character, her unaffected piety, her humble faith, and the singular purity and blamelessness of her life and conversation, that her friends will dwell with a soothing and delightful recollection. They will bless God that she was given to them; that they enjoyed her society so long, and that she has left behind her so bright and spotless an example.

The sickness, which terminated in her death, was long and accompanied with great bodily suffering. She had many distressed days and wearisome nights appointed unto her, but her patience and fortitude never forsook her. Her trust in God never faltered. 'My Maker,' she would sometimes say, under severe paroxysms of pain, 'my Maker has not forgotten me; he is still my Father, though his hand is stretched out over me in correction.' The more she suffered, indeed, the stronger her confidence in God appeared, and the more grateful she seemed for the supports and alleviations she was permitted to enjoy.

The closing scene of her life was affecting beyond description. She possessed her reason in perfect strength and distinctness to the very last moment. She took leave of her friends again and again with expressions of the most melting tenderness; and the only pang which death had power to inflict upon her, was connected with the thought that she should leave them sorrowing and desolate. For several hours she expected her change with the utmost calmness and composure. She spent most of the time in conversation with those about her, and gave them very solemn and appropriate advice. She expressed her strong belief that there will be a reunion of the virtuous in a future life. 'I shall see you again, I shall know you hereafter,' she said again and again to the friends who were weeping around her, and in this belief she fell asleep in Jesus; and those who suffer from this bereavement will find their only consolation in this belief, and in the remembrance of her virtues.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—No. IV.

JULY AND AUGUST, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

TO THE REV. PARSONS COOKE.

[The following letter, originally intended to have been sent directly to the person to whom it is addressed, was occasioned by the publication of a sermon entitled, 'Unitarianism an Exclusive System, or the Bondage of the Churches that were planted by the Puritans. A Sermon preached on the Occasion of the Annual Fast, April 3, 1828. By PARSONS COOKE, Pastor of the East Church, in Ware.' This pamphlet contains, besides what is noticed in the letter below, a reiteration of the false charge of persecution against the Genevan Church of the present day, which, after all that has been published to set the matter in its true light, it is difficult to believe is repeated in ignorance of the facts in the case, but which, if not so repeated, is as disgraceful to its propagators as the conduct they without reason ascribe to the Unitarians of that city; for it is the circulation of a false statement for the meanest of all purposes which can be entertained by a party to a controversy the single end of which should be the establishment of truth—the purpose of fixing upon antagonists an odium which does not in any way justly belong to them. It is of a piece, however, with all the rest of this specimen of the spirit of Orthodoxy, and is by no means so distinguished for its grossness above the ordinary character of the sermon, perhaps, as to have merited even this passing notice.]

REV. SIR,—

I received some time ago a copy of a sermon preached by you to your congregation in Ware, on the occasion of the Annual Fast of this year, which happened a few days before the general election for this Commonwealth.

As this discourse was avowedly designed to rouse your people

to a due exercise of their political rights, and to a sense of the importance of attending to the religious character of the candidates for office, it was without doubt well calculated to produce that effect, and probably had an influence on the suffrage on the ensuing Monday.

Had its office there ceased, I do not know that it would have been proper for any one without your parish to have taken notice of it, or made any inquiry whether your unqualified charge of designed partiality to a class of Christians to whom you would refuse the name, by all the departments of the government, Executive, Legislative, and Judicial, was founded in truth, or was a mere gratuitous assumption necessary for the object you have in view.

Whether a minister preaches true or false doctrines in theology, morals, or politics, to his peculiar people, is a matter between him and them, with an appeal finally to the Great Being in whose name he undertakes to speak.

But this sermon has been printed in a form for extensive circulation, probably with a view to make it one of the tracts of your party, and has been somewhat uncourteously sent by you, or some of your friends, to those public officers whose public conduct is therein most unjustly arraigned. Entire silence on their part will, I have no doubt, be very shortly construed as an acknowledgement of the truth of its representations, and, in your next appeal to the public, will probably be taken as proof of admission by those who hold office, that the spirit of exclusion, which you have altogether without grounds attributed to them, has been exercised in the manner you have alleged.

Far be it from me to accuse a minister of the gospel of wilful misrepresentations; for, however unceremonious your attack upon the characters of all whom the people have chosen to entrust with their most important temporal concerns, I feel too much respect for your sacred office to admit the supposition that you knew what you advanced to be untrue; but from the less heinous, though quite as mischievous fault of preaching and publishing injurious aspersions without inquiring whether they were true or false, I cannot acquit you. Whether zeal in support of what you think a good cause will justify this, probably in your opinion, venial sort of libel, is a matter of morals, if not of religion. In my opinion it concerns both.

I am told you are a young man recently settled under the influence of a very honest, but not very intelligent gentleman, who is notorious for his spirit of proselytism to what he con-

siders the only true faith; and under this impression I make some allowance for that bold denunciation of all the constituted authorities of the State, which ought to subject a more practised clergyman to severe animadversion.

It is no light matter to charge the three great departments of the government with an abuse of their trusts for the worst of purposes, that of discouraging religious men and excluding them from office. This, however, you have done openly, and circulated the charge extensively. You cannot, I think, complain, if one who thinks himself slandered, should endeavour to convince the public that the charge is untrue. If that charity which thinketh no evil, is not offended when a man of holy office libels the appointed civil rulers of the land, surely that which beareth all things will allow the calumniated to raise his voice in selfdefence.

To make a sermon from the sacred desk a vehicle of abuse against the civil fathers of the State, may entitle you to great praise among those who would overthrow the institutions by which the State is upheld, in order to erect on their ruins a power, which by you and them may be deemed a blessing, though in all ages it has been found a curse; but the wise and the good will consider your effort a perversion of your influence and office to the worst of purposes; and if the character of this people is not strangely mistaken, they will see in your attempts, what in other times would be considered portentous of great trouble to the Commonwealth.

It is not my design to examine minutely your discourse—the general temper and character of it are sufficiently objectionable without entering into details. I shall merely select a few passages for comment, in which I cannot but think, in addition to the bad spirit they breathe, there is a manifest want of decorum towards those whom, as a christian minister, telling his people that the powers that be are ordained of God, you were bound to respect.

You say in page 6, 'for a specimen of this manœuvering, just recur to the manner in which the offices at the disposal of the Executive, have been distributed.' By whom are these offices filled? By the Governor and Council. They then have been guilty of this manœuvering. And for what purpose? Why, to exclude from office all who do not 'give proof of their hostility to the religion of their fathers.'

Now this is a serious charge—and so far from being true, that it requires charity to believe that you yourself did not know it to be false.

Was Governor Strong in this plot, concerned in this manœuvering? He was always claimed by the Orthodox as belonging to that party, and yet the three Judges of the Supreme Court, who are supposed to be heretical, were all put into office by Governor Strong, and the only one of that bench supposed to believe in the religion of the fathers, was placed there by the heretical Governor Lincoln. But there was manœuvering in this, you suggest in a note, but do not explain why and how. I put it to your conscience, Reverend Sir, whether that note was not written merely because you found the fact of that appointment would go far to disprove the proposition you started with, that the Executive in its appointments has been influenced altogether by the exclusive sectarian spirit. But the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas are all of this exclusive sect. Who placed these gentlemen on that bench? Governor Brooks. Was he a man to be concerned in manœuvering in the exercise of the most important branch of his duty? Did he require that they should 'give proof of their hostility to the religion of their fathers?' One would think it were enough for a minister of religion to reproach and slander a living Governor, without disturbing the ashes of those who have gone to their account, and whose praise, when living, was in all the churches, as well as among the people.

But not only the Governor and Council have for a series of years been violating their duty and their oaths, abusing their trusts for the base purpose of advancing one sect of Christians, and humbling another—the Legislature itself, the representatives of the people, have partaken of the same spirit, 'has been pursuing measures of the most exclusive sectarianism.'—'For many years our Legislature have in all matters that in any way related to religion, manifested an exclusive spirit. Acts of incorporation and patronage have been withheld from literary institutions for no other reasons than their Orthodoxy.'

Is this true? Did you, Sir, believe what you preached? From what literary institution has incorporation been withheld? You mean the Amherst College. Do you not know, Sir, that the chief opposition to this was from the Orthodox, and that because it was thought injurious to another Orthodox College? Do you not know that the incorporation was finally carried by the votes of the Liberal party, and that nearly all the Boston members, all heretics, voted in the affirmative?

But you say 'Trustees of the Liberal class, have been thrust into the management of a college, endowed exclusively from Orthodox benevolence.' Ask President Humphreys if he did

not declare at the hearing before the General Court, that this college was to have nothing exclusive in its character—if he did not eulogize Harvard College, its institutions and instructers. Was this all to get the act of incorporation through, or was it sincere? If sincere, how can they now complain that such men as Judge Howe, Judge Lyman, Samuel Allen, and Governor Lincoln have been elected into their boards?

Having thus traduced the Executive and Legislature, this reverend champion of the religion of peace, charity, and order, next assails the Judicial department. 'The same sectarian spirit has *profaned* the temple of justice'—and then he charges the supreme tribunal of justice with confiscating the property of churches, robbing the altar of its furniture, &c.

No body of men unclothed with the vestments of religion, no individual however passionate, or vulgar, has ever used such language as this towards any even the lowest of our Courts of Justice. It was reserved for this meek minister of our meek religion, to arraign in this vituperative style a tribunal which has ever enjoyed the confidence of the community. And for what? For a painful exercise of duty on a subject coming before them in the ordinary course of their business, more than eight years ago, and acquiesced in by the public ever since. I say acquiesced in; for eight successive Legislatures have had their sessions twice a year since, and yet no one has remonstrated against the decision, or endeavoured to procure an alteration of the law. Is this the way for citizens of this Commonwealth—for ministers of the gospel, to conduct themselves when dissatisfied with a decision of our courts? Is this the way to teach submission to the powers that be? Why not apply to the Legislature to declare all churches corporations, and give them the right to control the consciences and the purses of the people of a congregation as they once had? Why not procure an alteration of the Constitution, and abolish that article of the Declaration of Rights, which secures to each religious society the right to contract with and elect its own ministers?

Why quarrel with the Court for deciding that some half dozen members of a large congregation shall not usurp dominion over the whole, and if they find resistance, shall not carry out of the temple the furniture and utensils which belong to them only as a part of that congregation? If this, being declared to be law, is inconvenient or unjust, why not, as in other cases, apply to the Legislature for relief? But the Legislature is in the plot, the Governor and Council are confederate with the Judges and the Legislature. How strange that all the world should conspire

against so meek and humble a spirit as Orthodoxy, and all this, too, owing to the criminal indifference of the Orthodox themselves, who, in spite of all this cruelty and persecution, will keep choosing men to rule over them, who are thus combined to oppress and destroy them!

But this is not all. Harvard College brings up the rear of the formidable enemies to the true faith. Lo! it was once Orthodox and is now Liberal—once blind and now can see. So one of these days it may be said of Amherst itself, if free inquiry should be allowed, as it was intended to be, if President Humphreys declared the truth respecting it.

This is a stale complaint about Harvard College. It was as Liberal when Doctor Pearson and Doctor Worcester educated their sons there of choice, as it is now; and the same Professor of Divinity was as much of a Universalist then as now. Reverend Sir, let me modestly ask whether you wrote and preached without a blush, the sentence in which you say that *Universalism* is taught by the Professor of Divinity of that College? Did you never read his solemn denial of the fact—his earnest call for the name of the person who charged him with it? Did you never observe the shuffling conduct of the Recorder upon the occasion? Pray tell me, who am not a casuist, is the whole system of morals discarded from the Orthodox theology? Are false assertion, calumny, concealed but active poison, lawful weapons in spiritual warfare? Is abuse of public agents, seditious appeals to the people against the government, open reviling of the law, sanctioned by the Calvinistic creed? Is the old maxim of the Jesuits, that all means are lawful to promote a good end, admitted by you in theory as it seems to be in practice? If so, you are consistent; if not so, you disparage the cause you would maintain. And here allow me to say that I cannot but think that the wise heads of your party had rather you would not have come out, at least so soon. They are not prepared for battle, and there is some danger, that the victory may be lost, by the too eager and premature onsets of some of their inexperienced subalterns.

I cannot leave you without a passing notice of your ingenious perversion of the text prefixed to your discourse—'The powers that be, are ordained of God.' Let me ask you candidly, Whom did the apostle intend by the 'powers that be,' the people or their rulers? Was he recommending respect for the laws and for those who make and administer them, or was he exciting the people to jealousy and dissatisfaction against those set over them in the Lord? After you have answered this question to

yourself, let me ask you another—Is your discourse a fair commentary upon the text, or is it a subtle abuse of it?

It cannot but be amusing to remark your wailing for the persecuted sect to which you belong. What! the proud Orthodox minister, who excommunicates all who dare think otherwise than he thinks, boasting that two thirds or more of the community are of the same faith with him, who says to the highest in the land, 'Stand off! I am holier than thou!' who denies christian fellowship and the name of Christian to the wise, the learned, the great, because they dispute his dogmas—does he belong to a poor, despised, and persecuted sect? So did the Pontiff when he shook the thrones of princes, and palsied the hearts of armies.

One thing which seems to perplex your mind, I think may be easily explained. How is it, you say, that with a vast majority of the people on your side, yet time after time, year after year we see successive Governors and Legislators taken from the ranks of the enemy? It is because the people are more enlightened, more liberal, more just than their ministers; because they do not make a party affair of their religion; because they can discern merit, value integrity, make use of talents, although their possessors may differ from them on points of theology, which none but those interested in gaining or preserving power can deem essential to the Christian. And it is this temper that ought to caution you, and others who set you on, or uphold you, that as soon as you unfurl the flag in an ecclesiastical warfare, deserters from your ranks will be sufficiently numerous to destroy your boasted majority.

I have done with you and your sermon for the present. If you think you are dealt harshly by, remember that, without any provocation and without any decency, you have assailed the actions and the motives of your temporal superiors—the whole government of your country—not the present only, but the successive Governors and Legislatures for years; that you have charged the Judges with corruption, partiality, sacrilege. There was a time when the whole civil power would quail under such a denunciation. That time is gone by. He ought to quail who utters it.

TO H——.

Sweet child! that wasted form,
That pale and mournful brow,
O'er which thy long, dark tresses
In shadowy beauty flow—
That eye, whence soul is darting
With such strange brilliancy,
Tell us thou art departing—
This world is not for thee.

No! not for thee is woven,
That wreath of joy and woe,
That crown of thorns and flowers,
Which all must wear below!
We bend in anguish o'er thee,
Yet feel that thou art blest,
Loved one! so early summoned
To enter into rest.

Soon shall thy bright young spirit,
From earth's cold chains be free;
Soon shalt thou meet that Saviour,
Who gave himself for thee!
Soon shalt thou be rejoicing,
Unsullied as thou art,
In the blest vision promised
Unto the pure in heart!

Yes! thou art going home,
Our Father's face to see,
In perfect bliss and glory!
But we, oh! where are we?
While that celestial country
Thick clouds and darkness hide,
In a strange land of exile,
Still, still must we abide!

O Father of our Spirits,
We can but look to thee!
Though chastened, not forsaken,
Shall we, thy children be.
We take the cup of sorrow,
As did thy blessed Son—
Teach us to say with Jesus,
'Thy will, not ours be done!'

A.

ON THE OCCASION, OBJECT, CONTENTS, AND DATE OF ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

It appears from the accounts we have of the first preaching of Christianity, after the death of our Saviour, that it was considered as intended for the Jewish nation alone. The apostles themselves, notwithstanding the instructions of their Master, seem for some time to have had no idea of Christianity as a universal religion, except in so far as it might be extended to the Gentiles, on the ground of their becoming incorporated with the Jewish nation, through circumcision and conversion to Judaism. Jesus was considered as exclusively the Messiah of the Jews, and the benefits and blessings of his kingdom, it was thought, were to be extended only to the Jews, or those who embraced the Jewish religion. That this was the case, appears from the history of the conversion of Cornelius, the conduct of Peter on that occasion, and the surprise manifested by the rest of the church at Jerusalem, at this event.

When therefore St Paul preached Christianity to the Gentiles, and baptized them into the name and religion of Jesus, without requiring the observance of the Mosaic law, a violent opposition was excited against him, his preaching, and the course which he pursued, by some of the Jewish Christians, who are supposed to have been of the sect of the Pharisees. Many of these had spread themselves abroad, had crept into the churches of Christians which had been formed among the Gentiles, and declared to them, that, except they were circumcised and adopted the observance of the Mosaic law, they could not be saved, or enjoy the benefits of the Messiah's coming. Besides the direct account of these teachers in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, and the notices of them in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, there are allusions to them in others of St Paul's epistles; as, probably, Philippians, ch. i. 15;—'Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife;' and ch. iii. 2;—'Beware of dogs, beware of the concision,' as it is rendered in the common version. There is also clear proof of the jealousy and distrust which was felt towards St Paul by the Jewish Christians, on account of his preaching among the Gentiles, in the Acts of the Apostles, particularly in chap. xxi. 20;—'And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him [Paul], Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are who believe, and they are all zealous for the law; and they are informed

of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews who are among the Gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.'

It appears from the Epistle to the Galatians, that the Judaizing teachers by whom Paul was opposed, had invaded the churches of Galatia, had acquired influence among the new converts, and were endeavouring to persuade them to submit to circumcision and the other ritual observances of the Mosaic law, as necessary under the gospel. St Paul says, ch. i. 6, 'I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ,' to the blessings of Christianity, 'unto another gospel.' Ch. iv. 9, 'Now after ye have known God,' after having been instructed in true views of the character and will of God, 'are ye turning again to the weak and beggarly elements,' that is, those imperfect principles of religion, 'whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage, and are observing days and months and years.' Ch. iii. 3, 'Having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?' Here the spirit, or spiritual religion of Jesus, is contrasted with the flesh, or less spiritual religion of Judaism, and the meaning may be expressed by rendering the passage thus;—'Having begun with what is spiritual, would you be made perfect by what is not spiritual?' Ch. iv. 21,—'Tell me, ye who desire to be under the law,' &c. Ch. i. 7,—'There be some, that are troubling you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.'

Under these circumstances St Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians, to prevent them from listening to the arguments and teachings of the Judaizing Christians, or submitting to the yoke and bondage of the Mosaic law. His object in this Epistle is to repel the doctrine of these false teachers, to declare the true conditions of acceptance with God, and enforce and illustrate to the heathens who had been converted to Christianity, the doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law; or the doctrine, that, under the christian system, a man is justified, that is, accepted by God, considered righteous in his sight, admitted to his favor, by the reception of Christianity and adopting it as the rule of life, without the observance of the rites and ceremonies, or works, of the Mosaic law. The language used by him is very strong, and his opposition to the Jewish teachers vehement and determined, as it was of great importance that correct views should be entertained on this subject. For the doctrine of the Jewish teachers was not only unsanctioned by Christ, but inconsistent with his instructions and contrary to the spirit of his religion. It was changing the character of his religion, a substitution of a superstitious observance of ceremonies for piety and virtue, answering in its essential features

to other substitutions which men have made of false religion for true, and thus rendering Christ of no effect.

Again, the doctrine which St Paul opposes, was taught by unauthorised teachers, by men not commissioned by God, or Christ, to preach Christianity, who were opposing him who was so commissioned, and, by their preaching, attaching to Christianity a useless and pernicious incumbrance, which would impede its progress, prevent it from being generally adopted, and thus defeat the purpose of its author. For these reasons he does not represent it merely as an unnecessary and burdensome yoke, but declares to them, that, if they are circumcised, Christ will profit them nothing, that every man who was circumcised was a debtor to keep the whole law. 'Christ is become of none effect unto you whosoever are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace;' that is, If you are circumcised, if you adopt the doctrines your teachers propose, you are giving up Christianity, it is of no benefit to you. If you hope for acceptance on the ground of the observance of the law, you have abandoned Christ; you have fallen away from favor.

It appears also from this Epistle, that the Jewish teachers had urged, that the apostles at Jerusalem considered the observance of the Mosaic law as necessary, that they endeavoured to disparage the authority of St Paul, representing him as only a deputy of the church at Jerusalem and of the other apostles, and that they pretended that his doctrine was to be regarded of authority, only in so far as it coincided with that which they ascribed to the other apostles and the rest of the church. St Paul, therefore, in the beginning of the Epistle, declares strongly his separate authority, and asserts, in the two first chapters, his independence of the rest of the apostles, having received his knowledge of doctrines from direct revelation. With this purpose in view, he gives an account of his conversion and subsequent conduct. It appears also that the Jewish teachers represented St Paul as having changed his opinion, or as holding it loosely and insincerely, and asserted or intimated that when absent from Galatia, he preached circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic law, as appears from ch. i. 10;—'Do I now seek to please men,' i. e. do I seek to conciliate the favor of men, by preaching circumcision? 'For if I yet pleased men, I should not be a servant of Christ;' also ch. v. 11,—'and I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then were the offence of the cross done away, or ceased.'

The principal facts, which will serve to explain the Epistle, then, are these. 1st. That the churches in Galatia were com-

posed in great part of those who had been converted from heathenism to Christianity. They were probably formed by St Paul on his first apostolical journey; for, although no mention is made of his visiting Galatia until his second apostolical journey, Acts, xvi., it seems most probable, from the way in which it is mentioned there, that the church had been formed previously by Paul and Barnabas, on their first journey through Asia Minor.* This is moreover rendered probable, by the mention of Barnabas, in the Epistle, as one known to them, who, it appears from Acts, xv. 39, parted from Paul previously to his second apostolical journey.

2d. That the new converts had received the gracious doctrines of the new religion, the glad tidings of Christianity, with great joy and eagerness, and testified great affection for St Paul personally; that in a short time, however, some of the Jewish Christians, who contended for the necessity of the Gentiles' adopting the Jewish religion, had gone among them, by their teaching and misrepresentation had acquired great influence, and induced many to submit to the observance of the Mosaic ritual, and to despise the authority of St Paul; that they had created dissensions and animosities among them, and conducted themselves in a licentious and disorderly manner. St Paul controverts their doctrine, asserts and vindicates his authority, refutes their false statements about himself, and affectionately exhorts the Galatians to purity in their conduct, to keep themselves from the evil influences of the doctrines and example of the false teachers, and to stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.

A synopsis, or general and connected view of the contents of the Epistle, will serve to assist us in the understanding of it.

St Paul, since his authority had been disparaged by the Jewish teachers, begins the Epistle by strongly asserting it to be separate and independent, not derived from men, but by divine appointment; 'An apostle not of men, neither by man,' &c.† He then, in the sixth verse, reproaches the Galatians with having fallen away from the gospel he had preached among them; 'I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, to another gospel.' He expresses, in the eighth and ninth verses, his firm adherence to the doctrines he had preached among them, and his conviction of their truth, and pronounces an anathema upon himself, or any other, who should preach a different doctrine. In the tenth verse he declares that

* See Acts, xv. 36.

† St Paul's address here, will be observed to be very similar to those at the commencement of his other epistles, except in the peculiar strength with which, on account of his peculiar circumstances, he asserts his apostolic authority.

he preaches, without regard to the prejudices of men, those doctrines which he had received, (verse 12), not of man, or from human instruction, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

He then goes on to give an account of his conversion and the course which he pursued subsequently, showing that from having been a persecuting Jew, he had become a zealous and independent apostle of Christ; relates his several visits to Jerusalem, his conference with others of the apostles, and the manner in which he was received by those of them who were high in estimation in the church, and states that the course which he had pursued, and the manner in which he had preached Christianity, had not met with their disapprobation or censure, but on the contrary that they had given him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; and speaks of his uniform resistance of all attempts of the Jewish teachers to infringe upon the liberty of Christians. In the eleventh and following verses of the second chapter, he gives an account of his reproof of Peter for his conduct at Antioch, in seeming to favor the notions of the Jewish Christians with regard to the Gentile converts. He had asked him, it seems, why he would compel the Gentiles to live as Jews, when by his preceding conduct he had shown that he did not consider it necessary. He then gives his reasoning with Peter. We ourselves, he said, who were born Jews, knowing that it is not by the works of the law, the observance of the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, that a man is justified, obtains the favor of God, becomes a good man, but by faith in Jesus Christ, the belief and reception of Christianity,—have believed in Christ, that we might be justified thereby, and not by the works of the law. If we, therefore, while we seek to obtain the favor of God through Christ alone, that is, as Christians, are ourselves found to be sinners by giving up the law, as Peter's conduct would seem to imply, then Christ is the minister of sin. God forbid, he says, that we should admit this, for it is a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, that the law is abolished. And he had further told St Peter,* that if he attempted to reestablish and build up what he had himself thrown down, he thereby declared himself to have been a transgressor, referring to St Peter's former neglect of the law. St Peter, it seems, before the Jewish Christians came to Antioch, had neglected the observance and requisitions of the law, by eating with the Gentiles; but after that, from fear of offending those Jews who came down to Antioch, and who held to circumcision and the strict observance of the law, he

* Though St Paul speaks, in the eighteenth verse, in the first person, it is evident from the connexion that he refers to the conduct of Peter.

withdrew himself from them. For this, for appearing to favor those prejudices, which, by his previous conduct, he had shown he diregarded, St Paul reproved him.

The object of the apostle in these two first chapters, after vindicating his authority, is, to repel the charges of looseness and insincerity in his conduct, and to show that, since his conversion, his conduct and sentiments with regard to the point in question, had been uniform and consistent, and his opposition to all attempts to impose the observance of the law upon the Gentile converts, determined and unyielding.

In the third chapter he proceeds to argue against the necessity of observing the Mosaic ritual. His first argument is, that they had received the spiritual blessings they enjoyed, by their instruction in the gospel, and not by the works of the law. 'Did ye receive the spirit,' that is, spiritual blessings, 'by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' He asks them, if, having begun with the spirit, with what is spiritual, they would be made perfect by the flesh, that which is less spiritual, or the Mosaic law, this being a term often applied to Judaism or the Mosaic law, by Paul. He then tells them that as Abraham had faith in God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness, that is, he was accepted with God, or treated by him as a righteous man, so they Christians, as Abraham's children, were admitted to the favor of God in the same way. In opposition to the belief of the Jews, that, as the natural descendants or children of Abraham, they enjoyed the favor of God, he represents those as designed to enjoy this favor, who are the *spritual* children of Abraham, who resemble him in faith, or are Christians. And in opposition to those who maintained that it was not enough for the Gentile converts that they were Christians, but that it was also necessary to adopt and observe the Mosaic law, in order to obtain the favor of God, he represents those who are under the law, as under a curse. For those who are under a law, and depend upon the strict observance of that for God's favor, are required to keep the whole law, in order to be entitled to its blessings, and any failure in observing it, subjects them to its penalties—a failure in a single article makes void the claim to acceptance upon the ground of mere law. The language of a law is the language of requisition. 'If you appeal to the law,' his argument runs, 'you have no claim to favor without observing the whole law; the promises of mere law are to perfect obedience only, and its threatenings to the slightest neglect.' To support what he says, the apostle, in the eleventh verse, quotes a passage from the Old Testament; 'The just shall live by faith,' the good

man shall be blessed through his faith; 'but,' he says, 'the law is is not of faith,' is not of the nature of faith, but its language is that of absolute requisition. 'The man that doeth these things shall live by them.'

It may be observed that St Paul's remarks do not apply to those who were under the law before Christianity, but to those who set up the necessity of conformity to it since the introduction of Christianity. Christ, the apostle says, had delivered them, by his ignominious death, from the curse of the law, that the blessings promised to Abraham might be enjoyed by the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that they might receive the promised spiritual blessings through faith. He then takes an example from the dealings among men in common life, to show that the law did not annul or set aside the promise made to Abraham, an objection which might be made by the Jews. As in the ordinary transactions of life, a contract between man and man, when once ratified, cannot be altered or set aside by anything subsequent, so the law, which was given four hundred and thirty years after, could not annul the promise made to Abraham, so as to make it of none effect.

Vs 18. For if the inheritance, that is, of the blessings of the Messiah's coming promised to Abraham, were claimed upon the ground of the law, upon the ground of having and observing the law, if it be attached to the observance of the law, then it ceases to be in consequence of the promise. But, he says, God did promise it gratuitously to Abraham.*

Vs 19. He replies to an objection which the Jews might make to the representation he had given of the law—'Wherefore then serveth the law?' For what was the law given, what purpose did it answer, the Jew might ask, if your representation be true? To this he answers that it was given on account of transgressions—nothing which they could glory in, of which they could make their boast; but, on account of their tendency to transgression, to be a restraint upon their wickedness until the seed should come to whom the promise was made—until the days of the Messiah.

Vs 19. 'It was ordained by angels' &c. that is, the law was introduced by the ministry of angels, 'by the hand of a mediator,' that is, Moses. 'Now a mediator is not of one, but God is one.'

* We may remark that, in the sixteenth verse, St Paul makes a distinction between two different classes of Abraham's descendants. 'Now to Abraham and his seed &c.' First, the Jews or the natural descendants, and second, the Christians or spiritual children, who were so because they resembled him in faith. He says the promised blessings were intended only for one class of descendants, that is, the Christians, and not for both. For a more full explanation of this passage, Gal. ix. 15, 16, see Christian Examiner, vol. v. p. 60.

There are different explanations of the meaning and design of this obscure passage. One is, that St Paul's purpose is to contrast the law as having been communicated to Moses by the ministry of angels,* with the promise to Abraham given immediately from the Deity †—and the apostle's argument is, that the law was not immediately from God, but through angels, by a mediator. For a mediator acts not for an individual, a mediator is not of one, but for a collection or body—But God is one. ‡

The apostle then compares the law with the gospel, or dispensation of faith, and represents the condition of those under the law as far inferior to that under the gospel. The law, he says, was not capable of producing that righteousness and holiness and blessedness which God wills—but when they were under its dominion, they were under restraint and bondage as children under a tutor, the law being given to prepare them for the more gracious conditions which were to be revealed in the gospel, the glorious liberty of the sons of God. 'For ye are all children of God,' he says, 'by faith in Jesus Christ; for as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,' or obtained the blessings imparted by Christ. There are no distinctions, he says, in Christianity. There is neither Jew nor Greek &c., referring to the distinction which the Jews insisted upon, but, being Christians, they are all equally Abraham's posterity and heirs of the promise.

Chap. IV. In the beginning of the fourth chapter, Paul continues the comparison he had before used, of their situation before becoming Christians, to that of children, who, while children, are under the restraint of tutors and governors, and differ in nothing from servants, being in bondage. But when the fulness of time was come, he continues, God sent his Son Jesus, to deliver those who were under the law, that they might become truly the sons of God, entitled to all the blessings and privileges of sons, and enabled, by the spirit of his Son, to look up to him as their Father. He then, in vs 9, reproves them for wishing, after enjoying these glorious privileges as Christians, and having been blessed with those views of the character and will of God which Christianity gives, to return to their former imperfect views of religion, those weak and beggarly elements,

* It was the opinion of the Jews that the law was given by the ministry of angels. See Acts vii. 53.

† A similar comparison of the law with the gospel, is given in Hebrews, ii. 1, 2.

‡ A different explanation of the passage in the text is given by Locke. A mediator acts between two parties. Now God is but one, and as Moses was not commissioned by the other party, viz. the seed of Abraham, the promise to Abraham cannot be set aside by the law.

to which they had formerly been in bondage, and to which they seemed desirous again to subject themselves, by superstitiously observing days and months and seasons and years.

In vs 12, he entreats them to be like him, to imitate his freedom from the Jewish prejudices, and reminds them in the following verses, of the affection and kindness they had formerly testified toward him, and contrasts the sincere love and interest for their highest welfare which he felt, with the narrow, selfish, and interested views of the Jewish teachers.

In the 21st and following verses he appeals to those who desired to be under the law, with an allegory drawn from the Old Testament, a mode of reasoning common among the Jews. In this, he says, the two children of Abraham, by the freewoman and the bondwoman, represent the two classes of his posterity, the Christians, and those who adhere to the law, or Jews. As the son of the bondwoman was born in the common course of nature, so the Jews were the natural descendants of Abraham; but the Christians were in a spiritual sense the descendants of Abraham according to the promise, corresponding to Isaac who was born in consequence of a promise. The bondwoman corresponds to Mount Sinai, or the covenant of the law given from Mount Sinai, and to Jerusalem which is now in bondage with her children. But the Jerusalem which is above, is free, and the mother of all Christians; and as the son of Hagar persecuted Isaac, so now the Jews, who correspond to the son of Hagar the bondwoman, persecute the Christians, who correspond to Isaac the son of the freewoman, born after the Spirit, or in consequence of the divine promise. He then quotes a passage from the Old Testament; 'Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman,' to show that the Jews, who adhered to the law as the ground of acceptance with God, were to be rejected from the inheritance of the blessings of Christianity.*

Chap. V. The apostle then goes on to exhort those to whom he wrote, to stand fast in this liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and declares to them, in the strongest manner, that by submitting to circumcision and the Jewish law, and making that the ground of acceptance with God, they in fact abandoned Christianity, rejected the blessings it offered them, and had no hold upon its promises.

* See an explanation of St Paul's design and reasoning in this passage, in the Christian Examiner, vol. v. pp. 61, *et seq.*

In the seventh and following verses, he alludes to the pernicious influence which the false teachers were exerting among them. In the eleventh verse he repels the false statement which had been made concerning him, that he was preaching circumcision; 'for,' he says, 'if I do still preach circumcision, why do I still suffer persecution?' that is, from the Jews. 'For then were the offence of the cross ceased,' that is, what is offensive to the Jews in the christian doctrine, would cease to exist.

In the remainder of the chapter he guards against any misapprehension of his meaning in what he had said of christian liberty, and cautions the Galatians against an abuse of the glorious liberty to which they had been called, showing that it does not consist in exemption from the laws of virtue and morality, and freedom to indulge in licentiousness, and exhorting them to a spiritual, or true christian life, exhibiting the difference between that and a carnal, or sensual life, or the life after the flesh.

In the beginning of the sixth chapter he exhorts them to kindness, affection, and good will to one another. In the seventh and following verses he seems to have reference to the licence of morals in which the false teachers, or some of the community, indulged themselves. In the twelfth verse he again alludes to the selfish and interested views of the Jewish teachers in wishing to subject them to the Jewish law, to acquire credit and authority among them, and glory in their weakness—'But,' he says, 'God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ,' and concludes with the usual salutation.

Of the period of St Paul's ministry to which this Epistle is to be referred.

There is a great diversity of opinion among critics with regard to the date to be assigned to this Epistle. There are no certain grounds on which to determine this point. The opinion usually adopted, is, that it was written a short time after the Council at Jerusalem, mentioned, Acts, xv. 1–7, where the subject of debate was the same as that discussed in this Epistle. The occasion and object of this Council is thus related in the Acts. 'And certain men which came down from Judea,' to Antioch where Paul and Barnabas then were, 'taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.—And when they were come to Jerusalem,

they were received of the church and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them. But there arose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees who were believers, saying that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the apostles and the elders came together to consider of this matter.'

This journey of St Paul from Antioch to Jerusalem, on the business of the Gentile converts, related in the passage just quoted, has been generally supposed to be the same as that mentioned in the second chapter of the Epistle, and, upon this ground, it is supposed that the Epistle was written after the Council. But there are strong objections to this opinion, and some reasons which seem to render it more probable that it was written before the Council. For, first, if we compare the account of the journey to Jerusalem mentioned in the second chapter of the Epistle, with the account in the Acts of that on the business of the Gentile converts, we perceive such a difference as renders it highly improbable that they were the same, upon which supposition the other opinion in great measure rests. 1. In the Epistle St Paul says that he went up by revelation; in the Acts we read that he was sent by the church at Antioch. 2. In the Epistle he represents his visit as a private one, and says that, when he went up to Jerusalem, he communicated that gospel which he preached among the Gentiles privately to them which were of reputation, which differs from the account in the Acts. But the great difficulty in supposing the Epistle to have been written after the Council, arises from St Paul's making no mention of the deliberation, or the decree, which was the result of the Council. It seems in the highest degree improbable, that, when writing on the very subject which was discussed at the Council, he should not have appealed to the decree, or taken notice of it in any way. On the contrary, his manner of writing seems to show, that his views and opinions had not yet received the formal sanction of the apostles at Jerusalem; for he begins with asserting his independent authority, and speaks of his independence of them, and of his difference with Peter in this affair, in such a manner as to intimate plainly, that, if the apostles had not openly differed from him, they certainly had not given their opinion publicly in favor of his views.

Again, the false teachers would not have *so openly* opposed the doctrines of St Paul after the Council; and there is no evidence that they did so after this event, from any of his epistles which were clearly written subsequently. Moreover, the conduct of Peter at Antioch, related in the second chapter of the

Epistle, which took place after the journey, and, according to the other opinion, after the Council, is unaccountable upon the supposition, that the decree, in promoting which he is represented in the Acts as having taken so active a part, had been passed before. It is highly improbable that he would have changed his opinions or his feelings so soon. The manner in which St Paul speaks of him, shows clearly that he was not countenanced by him; and there would have been no necessity for St Peter's pursuing the course he did, after the active part he had taken at the debate a short time before. We may add also that there was nothing to be gained by him as a matter of condescension. His real opinions could not be concealed. For these reasons, it seems most probable that the Epistle was written before the Council. There are no means of determining the precise time. It is probable that it was written at Antioch, during St Paul's long abode there, mentioned at the end of the fourteenth chapter of the Acts, where, after relating the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, it is said that they abode there a long time with the disciples. St Peter, we are told in the Epistle, came down to Antioch after St Paul's journey to Jerusalem, which will agree well with the supposition that the journey taken was at that time. Those mentioned in Acts xv. 1. as coming down from Jerusalem, may be the same as those referred to in the Epistle—'When certain came down from James.' It may be placed, then, a short time after this, in the disputes which then took place, and before the Council. Upon this supposition, therefore, it was written first of all St Paul's Epistles.

The Epistle to the Galatians is to us of the greatest interest and importance. It shows the state of feeling and opinion with regard to the nature and spirit of our religion, which prevailed among its first followers, and in the earliest stage of its existence. It shows us the disputes and differences which then agitated and divided Christians, and the grounds with regard to them taken by the different parties, and illustrates the style of reasoning and state of feeling prevalent among the ancient Jews. On one side we see the Jewish Christians, who had adopted, indeed, the religion of Jesus, but who understood and imbibed its spirit but imperfectly, with that zeal for the rites of their ancestors, and the sacred and venerable institutions of Moses, with that jealousy of the Gentiles and of the extension of Jehovah's favor to them, which has ever distinguished their nation, striving to attach to Christianity a heavy incumbrance, which threatened to obstruct its progress, to defeat its purposes of carrying peace and happi-

ness to all nations, of purifying the gross corruption and wickedness of mankind, forming them to purity and holiness, and fitting them for the enjoyments of immortal beings. On the other hand, we see one, who had also been educated a Jew and of the straitest sect, but who had imbibed the spirit of our religion, and was informed of its true nature and excellency, casting off all the feelings and prejudices in which he had been educated, and contending, with the utmost force and earnestness, for the immunity of the converted heathen from the bondage of ceremonies, for their equal and unconditional participation in the blessings and benefits of the Messiah's kingdom, and exhibiting our religion in its native purity and simplicity. We see him, sometimes in the language of indignant remonstrance, and sometimes of affectionate entreaty, appealing to the Jews with arguments drawn from their sacred scriptures; laboring to inculcate upon the heathens converted from idolatry, the true nature of Christianity, to free it from the corruptions which were already beginning to gather round it; teaching that the religion of Jesus was not one of forms and ceremonies, to be confined to a favored few, but one of universal application, intended for the blessing of the whole human family, the purification of the whole moral world, and declaring that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

The controversy between St Paul and the Jewish teachers, was of the highest importance to the interests and efficacy of Christianity, as intended to guide and regulate the moral conduct of mankind. It was a controversy between true and false notions of religion, between a religion of the heart and life, and one of mere forms and ceremonies. In the religious history of mankind, we observe a tendency to substitute the observance of external rites, for the more difficult and laborious exercises of selfdenying virtue and internal purity; to rest their hopes of the favor of God upon certain definite and established forms, rather than impose upon themselves the constant vigilance and restraint, which are necessary for the regulation of the internal character, and the proper cultivation of the heart and affections. Those ordinances, which have been appointed as means of moral improvement, for occasional memorials of our religious duties, to assist our imperfect virtue and excite our devotional feelings, have been substituted for the effects they were intended to produce. While these means have been scrupulously adhered to, the end for which they were instituted, and for which alone they are of any value, has been lost sight of. What is only incidental has been superstitiously adhered to, to the neglect of what is essential; and unrequired

ceremonies have taken the place of piety and virtue. The tendency of this is obviously to defeat the end of religion. This was the state of the Jewish religion at the time of our Saviour; it was against this corruption that a great part of his instructions were directed, and to correct these erroneous views was the object of much that he said and did. It is a similar corruption of Christianity that St Paul opposes in this Epistle to the Galatians. The Jewish teachers were endeavouring to load Christianity with an incumbrance of forms and ceremonies, to change its character, to lead men to regard the superstitious observance of certain external forms, as of the highest importance and as essential to acceptance with God—to place their hopes of his favor in the observance of the ritual of the Mosaic law, rather than in purity of heart and virtuous conduct. When we consider this, we shall not be surprised at the warmth and earnestness with which St Paul opposes their doctrine and combats their pretensions.

B.

REVIEW.

Art. IX.—*Vindication of the Rights of the Churches of Christ. First printed in the Spirit of the Pilgrims.* Boston, Pierce & Williams, 1828. 8vo. pp. 48.

A PERIODICAL work of the most bitter and malignant spirit, reviving and exaggerating all the exasperating sentiments and language of the departed Panoplist, has recently made its appearance in Boston. Whatever may be its professions, its real purpose is, to awaken a war *ad internecionem*, a war of extermination against all Christians, who do not belong to the dominant sect. It is precisely in the spirit avowed by Dr Ely of Philadelphia. 'No man,' says Ely, substantially, 'is to be eligible to any civil office, who does not subscribe to the doctrines of the five prevailing sects.' By this, we are to understand, that there is to be a combination among the most powerful sects, to seize the civil power, and the use they may hereafter make of it, is to be sought in the calamitous history of Christendom for the last fifteen hundred years. No man is to be elected into any office of honor or trust, who is not a *believer;* by which these gentlemen exclude every man who does not think as they do, on the subject of religion. It would be hypocritical in us to pretend that

we feel any apprehension that these men of violence will succeed—we do not call them fanatics, because that term is exclusively applied to those who have lost their reason, whose zeal is too powerful for their understanding. But our aspirants to universal domination in church and state, are a very cool and calculating people. They will not, like the Scottish Covenanters, inconsiderately risk their lives or even fortunes for their theories, but they coolly and cunningly seek the attainment of their great purpose, which is *power*—power of the most enticing, yet most fatal character to the welfare of a state or nation; power over the opinions of men on the most interesting and important of all subjects. In fact—we must not disguise it, the times require a fearless avowal of the truth—there is no power in its own nature so despotic, there is no power, against which human wisdom, intelligence, and industry are of so little avail, there is none which is so tremendous in its effects on the happiness and prosperity of states, as the theological power. It enslaves and debases the mind, and has led, and will forever lead to civil despotism. The successful conqueror will find it for his own interest to encourage the prosperity of a state. The theological tyrant feels, that his power can only be secured by debasing the human mind, and he always seeks an alliance with the civil power more effectually to accomplish his ends.

No man, even the most Orthodox or Exclusive, will deny, that such has been the tendency of Papal usurpations in every country of Europe. Richelieu, Ximenes, Mazarin were the firmest supporters of despotism. Loyola founded a sect, whose avowed purpose was, to govern all the thrones of Europe, and to degrade their subjects into slaves. What was the object? To promote the power of the sovereign, and the welfare of the state? No—to tyrannize over both. What has impeded the efforts of the Spanish nation to redeem their character and their rights? The clergy, an unprincipled and domineering clergy. What encouraged Don Miguel to overthrow the liberal Constitution of Portugal? The clergy. What has been the bane of the South American States, since they have thrown off the Spanish yoke? An ambitious body of clergy. What then would you infer from this? that Christianity is unfavorable to civil liberty, and to the improvement of the human character and condition? God forbid! Our only inference is, that *men love power;* and that even Christianity itself, pure as it is, humble as its first professors were, will not always divest men of their worst, and most dangerous passion, the love of power—a passion, which, if indulged, is the most dangerous, most absorbing, most injurious

to the welfare of mankind of any to which frail and fallible humanity is subject.

But it will be said, 'Your examples are all taken from the Romish Church. We all admit, that her garments are spotted with the blood of saints, that her ambition has been as boundless and her measures to ensure the gratification of it, have been as unprincipled as those of Napoleon, or any ruthless adventurer, who considered mankind as his lawful prey. But what charges can you make against Protestants—those excellent men, who, at every hazard, vindicated civil liberty and religious freedom?' We would not charge the Protestants with the maintenance of the same unbounded claims to supremacy, nor even with as great excesses. But we do say, that Protestants have shed freely the blood of their fellow Christians, for differences of opinion in matters of faith. We say that the Calvinists of Geneva and of Holland and of Scotland, have claimed the right to burn and banish other Protestants, who differed from them far less than the Catholics differed from the Protestants. The age of burning is now past. But the English Church has continued its persecution of the Dissenters to this hour. No marriage can yet be solemnized by a dissenting clergyman, be he Calvinistic or Unitarian. It is not more than twenty years, since the blushes of a British parliament compelled them to strike out of the list of crimes, the denial of the equality of the Saviour and Son, with the Almighty God, his Father and Creator. Now indeed, a better day is dawning on the favored land of our fathers. Bigotry is yielding. The Anti-catholic Peele has at last, rather ungraciously, assented to a repeal of the detestable acts of exclusion of the Dissenters, and we are happy to perceive that Unitarians are included in the late reluctantly forced concession. Indeed it is a matter of sober, but singular observation, that Great Britain, whose Established Church is professedly and eminently Trinitarian, is far more liberal towards the Unitarians, than the Exclusive sect in our country—a country which professes to tolerate all sects. The late case, which occurred in Ireland, where a professed Unitarian was clerk of a Presbyterian Synod, and was, by the bigots of that Synod, attempted to be displaced on that ground, but supported by an overwhelming majority, may well excite a blush on the cheeks of our denouncing and Exclusive hierarchs. There is not, in truth, at this moment, even a tithe of the principles of religious toleration in the Exclusionists of the United States, which exists in the Established Church of Great Britain.

We now come to a more precise examination of the article before us, which is a lame defence of the Result of the Groton Council, which was reviewed in the Christian Examiner for March and April, 1827. There has been no small share of address, and what the world would call artifice, in the manner, in which this defence has been brought out. Our review of the Result of the Groton Council, professed to be an entire refutation of all the arguments in that elaborate and studied performance, which was in itself rather singular in its history and character. The Council adjourned for a long period, to enable a learned committee to prepare an able argument. The proceedings bear date in August, and yet that eminent work, as the Exclusive Christians affect to consider it, did not reach the public eye, till the succeeding winter, when it was pompously ushered into the world, and circulated with an overweening assumption of its superiority to all other arguments, and more especially to the miserable, drivelling reasoning of Chief Justice Parsons, Judge Sedgwick, and Chief Justice Parker and his learned associates, in a succession of cases, for fifteen years past, which had never before been impugned or assailed. In our review, the public will recollect, that we disproved many of the facts, on which the Groton Result was founded; we showed that its authors were entirely mistaken in their views of the history of the church in this State; we demonstrated, that the churches of this State had never been considered as corporate bodies, and, of course, could not come within the proviso of the third article of the Bill of Rights, which gives to religious societies, or corporate bodies, the exclusive right to elect their teachers. Now, we ask, what is the course which these learned divines have taken to defend their attack on the Judiciary of this State?

Soon after the publication of our review, we were threatened with an overwhelming reply from the pen of the Great Guardian and Metropolitan of all New England. We were told, that he was busied in searching records, and was resolved to bring the whole weight of his most powerful mind, not upon us humble reviewers, but upon that miserable, inefficient man, Chief Justice Parsons, and upon his successors and associates, Chief Justice Parker and others—such as Putnam, Jackson, and Wilde. We have waited with fearful suspense the execution of these threats. The dreadful blow, which, it appears, another hand is employed to inflict, was preceded by an annunciation, in a late Orthodox pamphlet, * that it was coming, and would prove decisive.

* Review of a Pamphlet on the Trust Deed of the Hanover Church, p. 25, note.

It has appeared. *Parturiunt montes.* After one year's delay, the Spirit of the Pilgrims appears, with what is in fact but a new edition of the Groton Result, without a single change of the argument, and without even an attempt to meet one of the objections to that extraordinary production. Before we proceed to the consideration of the specious fallacies by which the Result of the Groton Council is attempted to be supported, let us give a history of the facts.

Some twelve or fifteen years since, the Rev. Mr Burr, of Sandwich, having been a Liberal preacher, and having taught his own parish to believe the doctrines which we now hold to be sound, saw fit to change his creed. We honor him for the frankness which induced him to avow his change of opinions. We hold his right to do so a sacred one, and though our opinion may be of little value to him, heterodox as he now esteems us, it gives us pleasure to bear witness to our early and intimate knowledge of his worth. But unhappily for him, his parish did not change their opinions as he did. They adhered to the exposition of the scriptures, which he had exposed to them. An unhappy schism took place, and by a regularly constituted tribunal, after the usages of the Pilgrim Fathers, he was dismissed from his charge. But a majority of his church adhered to him. The question came before the Court, the highest Court of the State. They were compelled to give a construction to that clause of the Constitution, which vests the power in the people, and they did decide, that Mr Burr was legally and constitutionally removed. The humble defender of the Groton Result, in the pages before us, calls this oppression, and intimates, in terms easily understood, that the Judges, Parsons, Sedgwick, and Sewall, violated their solemn oaths of office—were guilty, in fact, of perjury, by making a decision in favor of their own religious opinions.

He does not apply it to the case of Mr Burr, it is true. The public services and the great exertions of Parsons, and his unrivalled fame, induced his party to delay this charge, till they could attack one, whom they thought more vulnerable. But whoever reads the Spirit of the Pilgrims, will readily perceive that the charge applies to all the decisions; for, if the others, who pronounced the early judgments, were pure and unbiassed, how can they have ground to say, that those who followed and sustained, as by law they were bound to sustain, the legal principles settled solemnly by their predecessors, were corrupt and wicked? That they do make such a charge against Chief Justice Parker, their language abundantly proves. They purposely select the Chief

Justice Parker, though they well knew, that he only pronounced the unanimous opinion of the whole Court, consisting of Thacher, Wilde, Jackson, and Putnam. The Chief Justice is charged with being influenced in his solemn opinion, under oath, by his personal religious notions—with a wicked and unjust decision, oppressive to the churches, and destructive of their rights. He is moreover charged with plagiarism, with adopting the opinions and even language of an article in the Christian Disciple, on the same topic, as if that gifted magistrate had not resources in his own mind, far greater than those from whom it is pretended he borrowed. This, we affirm, is the substance and intent of the writer's allusion to that article. Though this charge, we are assured, will prove harmless, yet we cannot pass it by, without remarking, that we know something of this venerable magistrate. We have known him from his youth. Under the blessing of Divine Providence, he has been the artificer of his own standing and character. He had no powerful friends to protect him in youth. He has risen to his present high and honorable eminence, by his own unaided talents and virtues. He is, more eminently than any man in the State, the favored child of the people—of all the people, the illiterate and the learned—the rich and the poor.

Chief Justice Parker has, however, one consolation, of which the spirit of religious arrogance cannot deprive him. He shares with Washington, the elder Adams, and Jay, the fate which too often awaits a conscientious discharge of public duty. He should remember, that the same set of men, who attempted to blast the unsullied reputation of his illustrious predecessor, Chief Justice Parsons, by a posthumous calumny, have directed their attack against himself. He could hardly expect to escape censure, when that ornament of his profession and of his country, was charged with prostituting his great powers, and violating his oath of office in a judicial decision. Such a charge *was* made against that eminent man by the authors of the Groton Result. In our review of that hardy production, we challenged the author, or authors of it, to produce any evidence of its truth. The charge was this;—that Chief Justice Parsons declared, that the construction, which he, personally, put upon the proviso of the third article of the Bill of Rights, was one, which he knew the people would have rejected. In other words, he gave a construction to a most important clause of the Constitution, diametrically opposed to its obvious meaning, and to the sense in which the people understood it. The charge involved, necessarily, judicial corruption, and a hardened, as well as foolish avowal of it.

The author of the present work neither disowns the calumny, nor attempts to support it by proof. What! are we to infer, that these reverend assailants of the character of one of the highest coordinate branches of the government, hope to screen themselves by employing the pen of another? Or do they believe, that their clerical character, and the sacredness of their cause, will justify their departure from the laws of society, and relieve them of the responsibility which is attached to other citizens? Or did they hope to escape from public censure, because they stated this calumnious charge as a matter of 'tradition?' Let them consult their legal advisers, and they will tell them, that to say that there is a 'tradition' that a man defrauded his friend, or murdered his wife, is as punishable as a positive assertion of it.

Our reverend critics of the decisions of our highest tribunals, were fully aware, in their new edition by another hand, that they would be charged with an indecent attack upon the Judiciary. Their consciences were alarmed, and they attempted to parry the attack, by what, we are reluctantly compelled to say, are mere hollow and hypocritical compliments to the court whom they traduced. These are strong expressions, extorted from us with great pain to ourselves. Yet we owe something to our laws, and Constitution—something to the eminent men, who are deputed to administer them.

Now, as this vindicator of the rights of the churches has resorted to juxtaposition, and enumeration, in order to present in a stronger light, what he is pleased to call the selfcontradictions of Chief Justice Parker, we beg leave to present to our readers, in a condensed form, the contradictions of the vindicator. We think that the most candid will admit, that, if such contradictions had appeared in the writings of one of the 'world,' or an 'unconverted sinner,'—a 'saint' would have had no hesitation in pronouncing the subsequent eulogy of Judge Parker to be mere cant, intended to soften the just indignation of the public.

'It is the more remarkable that Chief Justice Parker should *hazard the assertions* he has made on this subject, since the distinction between church and town is *expressly recognized* in the grants to the church in Dedham.'—'Yet the Judge would *have us believe*, that, in the early settlement of our country, "there was no great distinction between the church and the town," and that "a grant to the church, under such circumstances, could mean nothing else than a grant to the town."!!' p. 28.

Here is an implied charge of wilful falsehood on the part of Chief Justice Parker, which, by the double notes of admiration affixed, appears to have excited the surprise and horror of the vindicator.

'The learned Judge will pardon us, if we think these subjects *not a little* out of his professional sphere. To be sure, *as a man*, he has the same right *as any other man*,'—a wonderful concession for one of the Exclusive sect, who virtually deny to all other men, the right of private judgment,—'*to form* his opinions, and to express them, on all religious subjects; but, as the highest judicial officer in the Commonwealth, sitting on the bench of justice, and acting the part, not only of a Judge, but, in some sense, also of a legislator, we really think he may better leave *disputed points in theology* to be determined in their *proper* place.' pp. 38, 39.

'In such utter *confusion* and *uncertainty* does the doctrine of the late decisions involve the ecclesiastical concerns of *this whole community*.' p. 41.

'The author of the decision in the Dedham case, is often *inconsistent with himself*.' p. 43.

The latter expressions are Italicized by the vindicator. Again;—

'If any person skilled in law, *or in anything else*, will analyze the following sentence, reconcile its different members, and make sense of the whole, we *will* be, 'meaning *shall* be,' very much obliged to him.' p. 44.

Yet of this weak, inconsistent, meddling magistrate, the vindicator, having the fear of public wrath before his eyes, thus speaks;—

'We have only to say further, that nothing here written is to be interpreted as *impeaching the professional ability of the Supreme Judges* of this Commonwealth. We believe them all, *and the Chief Justice especially*, to be men of talents, of learning, and of general good qualifications for the stations they occupy.' p. 47.

Now we ask, if the Judges do possess all these requisite qualities, and, these notwithstanding, have made so oppressive, absurd, inconsistent, and unconstitutional a decision, as this learned writer attempts to show they have done, what can we infer, but that they are corrupt, and therefore that his compliments are hypocritical, though our respect for his profession would make us hesitate to admit it? The clerical office is venerable, and entitled to our highest respect, when its functionaries behave in a manner worthy of their station. But the most venerable offices are liable to abuse. Men, sometimes, to the distress of all true Christians, are inducted into that holy office, who have every requisite quality, but the most valuable and important one, the spirit of our holy religion—the spirit of peace. There have been men of that profession, who, in all times, have been men of strife—men who have loved discord and dissension. When divines, mistaking their duty, which eminently obliges them to uphold the civil magistrate in his lawful functions, step forth, and with great zeal, hold up the magistrates as weak reasoners, as influenced by sectarian views in their solemn decisions, as plagiaries, borrowing their thoughts from occasional essays without examining

for themselves—more especially, when they stamp with their ill-informed censures, the decisions of the Courts, as oppressive and cruel to large masses of citizens, whom they arrogantly call the saints—the elect of the earth, and whom they intimate to be as far superior to ordinary men, as heaven is above earth—we may well pause, and we do pause, to ask, whether there exists in this country, or in any country not Papal, such a power to denounce whole masses of professing Christians. Heaven forbid that we should deny the right of any citizen to call in question the decisions of the highest Court of Law. There is no power so high, in our country, that its acts may not be the subjects of free discussion. But there is a manner and a moderation in everything. The decisions of the Supreme Court are the law of the land. In common cases, the Legislature may change the law, if the Judges decide against the public will. In the present case, the decision was founded on a construction of the Constitution, and no power, but the people, by an amendment of the Constitution, can change it.

The singularity of the present case consists in this, and it is indeed unique, and without example. Some Connecticut casuists, accustomed to a state of things, in which, we had almost said, the clergy hold all the power, and the people are accounted as nothing, have been in a time of excitement imported into this State. Bringing with them their own ideas of the supremacy of the clergy, they quarrel with the liberal and ingenuous feelings of our people, and wish to persuade them, that the chains and fetters of Connecticut are indeed very comfortable things, and well suited to the wrists and ancles of the stubborn freemen of Massachusetts. They tell us, in plain terms, that the liberty which we have acquired, with great toil and suffering during a contest of two centuries, is no liberty at all, and that if we would only quietly consent to the easy handcuffs, which they, from long experience, have learnt to forge, we shall be more at our ease than we were before. These imported directors of Massachusetts consciences, assure us, that we are anxious for this change from freedom to slavery—that tens of thousands of our people really groan under the liberty, which our excellent Judges, by a correct and manly exposition of the Constitution, have opened to us. We challenged them in our review of the Groton Result, to explain why, if such are the sentiments of our people, and if, at heart, they do really prefer slavery to freedom, why, when this specific article was discussed at the noblest and fullest collection of the intellect and wisdom of Massachusetts, the late Convention for revising the Constitution, the Orthodox did

not dare to move the question, although Judge Parsons's decisions were then of old date, and Judges Parker, Wilde, Jackson, and Putnam's judicial sentences were recent and festering sores in the bosoms of the Exclusive and intolerant sect? We have had no answer to this question, except the repetition of the same idle boast, the more loud because there is a consciousness of its idleness, that the people are alarmed, and uneasy. Now, we challenge them, after both parties have been fully heard, to move this year, at the winter session, an amendment of the Constitution, restoring the churches to their usurped power, and we promise our support in the attempt, confident that the people would reject it with disdain.

Before we proceed to examine the argument, if it deserves the name, of the writer in question, we shall notice a particular attack on Chief Justice Parker, which, as it was very amusing to us for its modesty, so we doubt not it will be equally so to our readers for its novelty, and accuracy of thought.

'We object,' says this learned divine and still more learned lawyer, 'to the views expressed in the decision of the Dedham case, that they are too evidently of a *sectarian* character.'—'We do complain that the highest judicial officer in the State, while seated on the bench of justice, should allow himself to go into a discussion of *theological questions*, and make them a ground of his decision, in a way to favor one religious denomination, and to *prejudice others*. The Constitution wisely provides, that "no *subordination* of any *one* sect or denomination of Christians to another, shall ever be established by law." We would inquire, then, whether it can be *constitutional* for an officer of the government, whose decisions are to have the *force of law*, to attempt *determining points of theology* which are at issue between different denominations of Christians.' p. 38.

This then is the charge, that Chief Justice Parker, unconstitutionally, by a solemn decision, 'established by law' a subordination of other sects to some *one* sect, and this the writer declares to be the Unitarian sect.

What, in the language of Courts Martial—for this is a belligerent attack on the Chief Justice—what is the *specification* to support this charge? It is in these words, that he '*took upon him* to say, that the "practice of the Episcopal Churches," in regard to the Sacrament, "is more conformable to the practice of the primitive Christian churches, than that of most of those who dissent from their mode of worship."' That is to say, that Chief Justice Parker, himself not an Episcopalian, by his decision, made the other churches *subordinate* to the Episcopalian; for, if he did not effect this, it could not be unconstitutional. Does this anonymous vindicator of the churches believe, that the Court decided, as a point of law, that the Episcopalian mode of ad-

mission to the sacrament was the primitive one? If so, it is the *law of the land!* and must be obeyed till changed by legislative enactment. We know well, that this is too ludicrous for refutation, and yet it was not too ludicrous for our divine seriously to urge. What sort of readers did the vindicator of the rights of the churches mean to address? Must he carry into his legal arguments, the same strain of dogmatism, to which his theological connexions have accustomed him, and does he expect, from an enlightened public, a blind submission to his legal *dicta*?

This is not all. He adds, in a tone of selfcomplacent triumph—'The learned Judge will *pardon us*, if we think these subjects *not a little* out of his professional sphere.' '*We really think* he may better leave *disputed points in theology* to be determined in their *proper* place.' Is any place improper for Christians to examine disputed points on the most important of all subjects? But how modest and delicate this reproof of a Court of Law, on the part of a divine who is discussing and reviewing the decisions of eminent jurists!—of a divine, who quotes Coke upon Littleton, and prates about prescriptions and *cestui que trusts*, with the confidence of a barrister of fifty years' standing! It was, however, no point of theology, upon which Chief Justice Parker, in a course of reasoning, expressed a private sentiment. It was simply a question of history, to which he was as competent as his reverend reviler. Lawyers may study what they are bound to study by the most momentous of all motives, and though this writer, a stranger in this vicinity, may be ignorant of it, we can assure him, that the predecessor of Judge Parker, Chief Justice Parsons, was one of the most learned theologians in our country, and if he ever heard of Lord Chancellor Sir Peter King, we can assure him, that he wrote a treatise clearly establishing the *right of all professing* Christians to partake of the sacrament, which if he has an inclination to answer and the ability to refute, we have certainly underrated his presumption as well as his powers. But before he undertakes the task, we advise him to read a little more, and to reason not a little better. He ought to know, that the authority of the early fathers, who were nearly cotemporary with the apostles, is not so clearly in his favor, and that the learned Chancellor did not differ so much from Chief Justice Parker, as he did from this critic on this point. But it is alleged, that the Chief Justice went out of his 'professional sphere' in giving out this suggestion. How does the writer know that? Was he present at the trial? Does he not know, that this very point was a part of the argument,

of which it was proper to take notice? Yet it was no *decision*—and nothing but gross ignorance of the course of judicial proceedings, can apologize for attacking it as such.

We have made this introduction longer than we proposed, and yet less could not have been said, in justice to the memory of the dead, or the character and merits of the living. The habit of abuse has been so confirmed by long indulgence, on the part of the Exclusive sect—they have so freely and so incessantly arraigned the clergy and the flocks of the Liberal party, that they cannot check the disposition to it. The highest tribunals have become the objects of their scorn and contempt. The very fountains of justice are attempted to be disturbed, and instead of honoring, as the apostle of their Lord and Master commanded them, those in rule and authority, they invoke upon them the maledictions of the whole community. To that sovereign tribunal we appeal with alacrity and undoubting confidence.

There are three distinct classes of readers in our community. The first estimate the value of an argument principally according to its length. The greater the number of pages, the more convincing, in their view, is the work. They are in a state of wonder and admiration, when they perceive a long array of quotations from books which they have never heard of. They never dream of inquiring whether the passages quoted have any bearing on the question. Especially are they moved if the quotations are made from the holy scriptures. Their deserved veneration for the sacred volume induces them to believe, that, if the writer cites chapter and verse, his argument must be sound. Though the text may prove the directly opposite proposition from that for the support of which it is cited, they never trouble their heads about such a trifling objection. The author quotes scripture, and it must be true. This class of readers think that ten weak arguments are more than equivalent to one unanswerable one. There are certain writers who perfectly comprehend this weakness of human nature, and they studiously avail themselves of it. They know that the impression once made on such slow and feeble understandings, can never be effaced. The very defect, which disabled them, in the first instance, from detecting the fallacy in reasoning, or the inapplicability of an authority cited, makes them obstinate in resisting an attack on their once settled opinions.

There is a second class, who read with the view and the capacity to understand a question; to whom mental exertion is a pleasure; who feel it a duty to exercise the noblest gift of God to

man in the investigation of truth. Such men value a work on any subject, precisely in proportion to its claims on their respect as rational beings. A multitude of words, and declamatory appeals to their passions, put them on their guard. They distrust those who make a great parade of their learning, when the occasion does not require it. If they detect a disposition to sophism, and fallacious reasoning, they examine the work with a natural and just suspicion. This class of readers have a most thorough contempt for inapposite, random quotations, and they prefer one sound solid reason, which approves itself to their enlightened understandings, to a volume of questionable and feeble arguments.

The third class of readers are your enlisted party men, who bravely resolve to praise whatever their party leaders may please to say, be it right or wrong, and who resolutely refuse to read anything which may be offered against it. Such persons, and they constitute no inconsiderable proportion of some sects, are beyond and above, or below, reason. They have a thorough dread of it—a very natural dread of it, because it is a faculty of which they have but little conception, and we always have a superstitious fear of the unknown. It need not be said, that we do not address this well disciplined Macedonian Phalanx. We know very well that they will abuse us, without knowing why.

To the second class of readers, who peruse with willing and intelligent minds, we shall present a brief and condensed view of the question at issue, for there is but one question in the case; and we advise them to stop and read no more, for the rest of our remarks are not intended for them. They are designed to show the first class, the ignorant and undisciplined minds, that all which appears to be gold, is not such.

The only question at issue between the nine Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court, dead or living, who are attacked, on the one side, and the vindicator of the churches, on the other, is merely a question of property, and that comparatively of little value. Nine tenths of the churches in this State have no property whatever, except the communion plate, and that frequently has been purchased by the parish, or given by opulent men, often non-communicants. The Courts of Law have, in all their decisions, expressly admitted, what this writer and his coadjutors have so much labored to prove, that the church is a body, not a corporate one, known to our laws; that it is entitled to high respect as a religious body; that the usages of our ancestors, in giving a preference to that body in church affairs, especially in the election of officers, pastor and deacons, are to be held in veneration, and to be preserved—subject, however, to be so overruled

by the rights of all freemen, and the principles of all free institutions, that if the majority cannot agree with the church in opinion, the great principle of the sovereignty of the people must prevail. They recommend that the church should exercise its ancient usage of election in the first instance, but if their choice should fall upon a person not agreeable to the parish at large, as to his sentiments, talents, doctrines, manners, or character, the final power must rest, where the Constitution has placed it, in the people.

The whole amount of the decisions of Parsons, Sewall, Sedgwick, Dawes, Thacher, Parker, Jackson, Putnam, and Wilde, has been, that if the members of the church, after attempting to compromise, come to a direct quarrel with the people, who are taxed for the support of the pastor, the Constitution gives the power, in the last resort, to the whole public. The church may withdraw, they may form a new society, and elect their own pastor; but he will not be the pastor of that parish, but of a new and a legal parish; they cannot carry with them the parochial property. Now let us pause to examine this question, not by the force and authority of the decisions of the Court, great as the authority of such opinions are, but by the light of reason.

Church property consists of donations to the church, but in all cases, without one exception, to the *church of a particular parish.* The Brattle Street, and the First Church in Boston, hold real estates given to the use of the ministry in these churches. Suppose a discord between the church and people in those societies, and that the people, under the constitutional provision, choose a minister, which it is now reluctantly admitted they have a right to do, and that the church, dissatisfied, remove *en masse*, by a unanimous vote, which we all admit *they* have a right to do, and choose their own pastor—Will the pastor of the church be the minister of the church in Brattle Street? Could he, when settled in Berry Street or in Hollis Street, for example, maintain a suit against the resident minister of the Brattle Street Church, for his house in Court Street? To lawyers, the proposition would seem at once to be absurd. Nor is the difficulty merely technical, it is a very substantial one. The Church in Brattle Street was gathered according to the usages of our ancestors; and surely, when the church, that is to say, the frail and fallible individuals, who are mere men, choose to withdraw, from pique or principle, that society of worshipping Christians have as good a right to form a church, as the first four or ten or twenty members originally had, and they would be the lawful church of that parish. Will the Orthodox

or Exclusive sect deny this? If they would, why, in the parish of Mr Morey and Mr Storer, did they institute a new church, comprising the minority of the old church, without obtaining dismission from the old church, and pending a petition for such a dismission, contrary to the Cambridge Platform? The truth is, that the Platform, and the usages of our ancestors, are, in their hands, like clay in the hands of the potter. They mould and fashion them according to their present interests, holding probably, that heretical churches, as they account heresy, have no rights.

There are great, and unanswerable reasons for the decision of the Court in the Dedham case. Property granted to churches was granted unquestionably from local attachment; from attachment to the society and place in which the donor worshipped. Can a Court overlook this important consideration? Let us apply it to cases much stronger in our favor. The Andover Fund was granted by the Phillips family, solely, or principally, to do honor, and to advance the prosperity of their native town. The trustees, however, reside in various parts of the State. The property is absolutely vested in them. Could they remove the institution from Andover? The Roxbury Grammar School was founded for teaching the poor of Roxbury. Could the trustees, by removal to Dorchester, transfer the funds to that town? But these are supposed cases. Let us take an actual one. There was a project, started by the Orthodox party, for removing Williams College to Northampton. Remove it they undoubtedly with legislative aid could have done. But could they legally have carried with it Mr Williams's donation? No man could pretend to maintain a proposition so unjust. Grant, then, for argument's sake, that churches are corporate bodies; could they, in disseverring voluntarily their connexion with another corporate body, with which they had been indissolubly united by our laws and usages, carry with them funds granted to them by a characteristic local name, which of itself confined them to a particular spot? Our author, aware of this, seems to admit, that though a church may remove a mile, yet they could not carry the church funds to Ohio—a concession, which, of itself, yields the whole argument. Could the President and Fellows of Harvard College in Cambridge, carry the funds granted by Harvard, to the School at Newton, or the funds of Holworthy, Hollis, Eliot, Parkman, Gore, Perkins, and many others, into Canada, or to Amherst? Yet the argument is as strong in favor of such a removal, as that in favor of a church, which should choose to separate itself from any society, be it a parish by limits, or a pew parish.—Let it be recollected, that in this brief, and, as we think,

conclusive view of the whole dispute, we admit, *pro formâ*, for the sake of argument only, all the absurd, and easily refuted arguments of the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims;' a spirit, which the Pilgrims, honest and conscientious as they were, would indignantly have disclaimed. They were not the men, to claim the property which belonged to others by every title, sacred and profane.

But to proceed with our examination of the pamphlet under review;—the first point, assumed by the vindicator of the rights of the churches, is one of very little moment, and which may soon be dismissed; namely, that there were in the days of the apostles churches distinct from congregations.

We may admit this to be true, without in any degree conceding the inference drawn from it. When the whole world was heathen, with the exception of the apostles and a few converts, it may be admitted, that many attended their preaching who were not converted to Christianity. But what bearing has this fact upon the present state of a christian people, where all are professing Christians, and all members of christian societies?

It is not, however, admitted by Sir Peter King, who has examined this question profoundly, that there was, in the early ages of Christianity, any distinction between the children of believers, who had been baptized, and other Christians, as to the right of admission to the sacrament. The Romish Church, and the English Episcopal Church know of no such distinction at the present day. The English Church, to be sure, have adopted the practice of confirmation by the bishop, but comparatively few are ever confirmed, and yet all are admitted to the communion. By what right are any excluded in our churches? Where is the text of scripture, which gives to the priest the right to say, 'You shall not commemorate the death and sufferings of your Lord and Saviour, though by the rite of solemn baptism, you have been admitted into the christian fold?' No such text can be produced, no such early principle and practice of exclusion can be found. A baptized Christian, of good moral character, in the greater part of the christian world, has, as he had in the early ages, an acknowledged right to exercise all the powers, and to perform all the duties of a Christian.

The next point of the vindicator of the rights of churches, is, that in Massachusetts, the churches, from the settlement of the country, were an exclusive body, chose their own pastors and other officers, &c. This is not denied, and the writer admits that it is not denied. This is the very essence of our complaint against the early settlers, that they were usurpers over God's

heritage; that they shut the door of the sanctuary to all but themselves or their friends, to all who would not adopt their creed. They did more, and we pause to ask whether our ambitious divines of the Orthodox church do not aim at the same usurpation—they interfered with the civil and political rights of the people. They availed themselves of their power over the minds of a very pious and excellent race of men, to extort laws which fettered the civil ruler and the people. They procured a law, that no man should be a freeman, unless he was a church member. The clergy often dictated to the Legislature the laws which they should enact. They forced down the Cambridge Platform, though it was resisted with great pertinacity, and their usurpation lasted, though not without frequent disturbance, till 1692. All this is admitted on both sides. But when has it been heard before, since our revolution in 1775, that the fact that abuses and usurpations existed in the reigns of the three Stuarts—for it was not till the expulsion of Sir Edmund Andros, that any Englishman in this province was truly free—when was it ever pretended that old usurpations were authorities to govern the present state of society? At that time we had a royal governor, and our laws were subject to royal revision. It is, however, confessed by our opponent, that, in 1692, the people gained a victory over the priests and the church, that is, over the hierarchy. We do not use these terms unadvisedly, or by way of opprobium. We say soberly, that no power was ever more despotic, than that of the New England churches, in principle, down even to 1720.

But in 1692 the people were restored to their natural rights. All Christians had a voice on the most important of all subjects, which regards the success of their religion. All men had an equal interest in the piety, the talents, and the capacity of their religious teachers to unfold the counsels of God. All men, of course, had an equal right to a voice in selecting their religious teachers. And, in truth, there is no middle course, no halting between two opinions. Either the church is confined to a privileged caste, a favored few, or it is the property of all believing Christians, and, in this age, there exists no miraculous power in the clergy, or self-styled church, to distinguish between professing and believing Christians. Open immorality is good cause of exclusion from the sacrament. Opinions are sacred, and no man has the power to judge his brother as to them. These are not *our dicta*, but they are those of our Saviour and of his apostles.

The victory of Christians was completed in 1692. This is admitted by the vindicator of the rights of the churches. But to what a subterfuge is he driven, to elude this decision of an awakened

and long oppressed people? Why, truly, to one which escaped even the penetration and subtilty of the framers of the Groton Result. It is this, that the law of 1692, restoring to the *people* their inalienable right of choosing their *teachers*, did not affect the right of the *church* to choose its own *pastor*. Here, is broached and brought forward in full relief, a metaphysical distinction between the offices of *minister* and *pastor*. The minister belongs to the society, the pastor to the church. The writer admits, throughout his whole work, that the society may choose its minister, but that he is no pastor. Well, then, what is he? He has a right to administer the communion, to baptize, to marry—I speak of *our laws*—and what is the pastor more? He has no greater authority. Is there a glebe or parish house? The minister is entitled to it. Is there an exemption from taxation by law? The minister can claim it. It is, in truth, one of the most pitiable evasions, which could occur to a writer, driven to extremity; and no man would dare to bring it forth, who did not count upon the entire command he possessed over minds habituated to obey and to believe, without the exercise of reason.

But pray, if it were true, as this writer pretends to have discovered—and the discovery is all his own—that the statute of 1692 left the church in the undisturbed possession of its right to choose its own pastor—why did the churches exert all their influence at the polls in 1693, and procure an act vesting the church with a *concurrent* power with the people? Why were they contented with a divided power for eightyfive years, when, as this writer pretends, the church was left in possession of the whole power of electing its pastor? Does the history of the priesthood authorise the belief, that they have ever been willing to divide the power with the laity, when they could avoid it? Why not proceed to exercise the absolute power reserved to them to choose their own pastor, and leave the laymen in possession of all the power they ever coveted, to choose their own minister? It had been well if they had done it. The separation in 1692 would have been a most auspicious separation, and the dawn of religious freedom would have been one hundred years sooner than it actually was. No—finding the power departing from them, they consented, reluctantly, to share it with the people, and they have now the effrontery to praise this division of power, as one of the most happy devices which human ingenuity could have framed, to reconcile the interests of all classes of Christians. Such is the language of the Groton Result; but how hollow all such professions are, we may learn by facts, which

speak a stronger language than any professions. We allude to the *trust deeds* of various Calvinistic churches, by which the arbitrary, despotic principles of 1641 are revived in all their intolerance. In these *trusts*, we hear no more of their professions of respect for the *right of the society* to choose *their teacher*, but the whole power is reserved to the church, and that too, on a principle far more reprehensible than that of our ancestors; for *they* did not confine the *church itself*, to all ages, to a particular creed, but our usurpers bind the church, by legal, artificial devices, always to construe the scriptures as they do. Search them they may, but if the research shall change their faith, they must quit their property, or surrender their consciences.

[To be continued.]

ART. IX.—1. *The Future Punishment of Infants not a Doctrine of Calvinism;* 2. *The Future Punishment of Infants never a Doctrine of the Calvinistic Churches;* 3. *On the Future State of Infants;—three Letters addressed 'To the Editor of the Christian Examiner,' and published in 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' for January, February, and March.* By the Rev. LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Boston. Pierce & Williams. 1828. 8vo. pp. 43.

[Continued from page 263.]

AFTER Calvin, the next authority we originally quoted to show that the doctrine of infant damnation is a part of Calvinism and has been held to be such by approved Calvinistic writers, was Turretin, who, as we have already remarked, is reputed to have given a more complete system of Calvinistic theology than even his master. But, says Dr Beecher, 'Turretin, as quoted by the reviewer,' teaches only that infants deserve damnation, not that they are actually damned, and 'we might as well have quoted "Adam, Seth, Enoch."' This, as usual, he attempts to show by a syllogism in which he takes for granted the whole matter in dispute; viz. that all we have produced from Turretin really amounts to no more than Dr Beecher finds it convenient to report to his readers. What he reports, however, is but a part of what we adduced or referred to, and, as in the case of similar passages from Calvin, was cited by us merely to show how naturally the doctrine in question results from essential vital principles of Calvinism. Even those of our quotations

which he regards as not to our purpose, Dr Beecher does not lay before his readers, that they may have an opportunity to decide upon them for themselves, although he might have known that his bare assertion that they are inapplicable, would not make them so.

What then are the facts? Did we, as Dr Beecher asserts that we did, produce Turretin as a believer in infant damnation, on no better ground than his teaching 'that infants, as corrupted by original sin, do deserve damnation?' Certainly not. The very remark we begun with, was, that, 'on the doctrine of original sin and the ruin that it brings upon infants, he [Turretin] quotes with approbation some of the most offensive passages in Calvin's writings;' and had Dr Beecher looked at one of the paragraphs to which we referred him,* he might have found among those offensive passages, the following;—'*Iterum quæro unde factum est, ut tot gentes unâ cum liberis eorum infantibus æternæ morti involveret lapsus Adæ absque remedio*, &c.,—a passage, which our learned author has some reason to remember, and which, as we have demonstrated, teaches undeniably the 'monstrous doctrine' that infants are damned.†

Besides, we made an extract from Turretin, in which he gives the very interpretation to Romans, v. 14, which, in the case of Dr Gill, Dr Beecher himself has been compelled to admit, makes that text teach actual infant damnation. 'Death reigned,' says St Paul, 'from Adam to Moses, even over such as had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' By 'such as had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,' Turretin tells us, repeatedly,‡ that the apostle meant INFANTS, and, by the death that reigned over them, he thinks St Paul meant not only natural, but spiritual and ETERNAL DEATH. Such is the teaching of 'Turretin, as quoted by the reviewer,' and yet Dr Beecher tells us we have shown only that he taught infants deserve damnation, not that their merited torments are actually inflicted, though it appears that we referred him to one

* Turrettin. Institut. Theologiæ. P. I. p. 686. Ed. 1696.

† We have already said so much and given so many translations of this passage, that even the unlearned reader who has followed us thus far, may dispense with a rendering of it here, or we would add to the versions by Professor Norton, Jeremy Taylor, Thomas Norton, Nichols, John Calvin, and ourselves, that adopted by Bishop Hobart of New York, and the Rev. Daniel Burhans of Connecticut, who both regard it as teaching 'that the fall of Adam did wrap up in eternal death so many nations, with their children, being infants, without remedy.' See a sermon, entitled, 'The Scripture Doctrine of the Election of Jacob and Rejection of Esau, considered. By Rev. Daniel Burhans, A. M. Rector of Trinity Church, Newtown, (Conn.)' Sec. Ed. p. 17, where Dr Hobart is referred to, thus; 'Apol. p. 264. Note.'

‡ Institut. Theol. P. I. pp. 508—9, quoted in our review; also pp. 523, 683, 698.

passage in which he approves of Calvin's doctrine that infants are *remedilessly* involved in the fall, and actually quoted another, in which he represents them as under the dominion of eternal death! Was it honest, while pretending to give an account of our citations from this author, to omit all mention of these decisive passages, or must we regard it as another illustration of what Dr Beecher assures us of himself, and seems determined we shall not want reasons for believing, viz. that 'in matters of importance he is not disposed to stand about trifles?' That we did not mistake the interpretation which Turretin gives to the words of St Paul, will appear from the following sentence, taken from his attempt to prove the imputation of Adam's sin from Romans, v. 12, 13, 14, &c.

'The death which *reigned* through sin,' he says, 'embraces within its compass SPIRITUAL DEATH, according to the threatening of God.'*

Again, Turretin contends that original sin, is '*propagated* from Adam to all his posterity, who are to proceed from him by natural generation,' and, in the course of his seventh argument, again speaks of the reign of death as follows;—

'"By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," Rom. v. 12, where,' he says, 'the apostle ascends to the first infection of evil, and discovers the origin of sin and death, to wit, the first sin of man, which entered into the world, that is, among mankind, both by imputation and by propagation, which the apostle proves from the circumstance that DEATH, the necessary effect of sin, *reigns* over all, *external* and temporal, as well as *internal* and spiritual, and also ETERNAL [DEATH].'†

In these passages, the *death* mentioned in Rom. v. 12–14, is explained to be, not only natural, but also SPIRITUAL and ETERNAL DEATH, and in the following extract Turretin asserts that the empire of this death extends over infants, as he had before said in the passage we cited in our review.

'So far,' he contends, 'is the apostle from wishing to deny that that sin was imputed, that he rather means to prove the contrary, which he infers from vs. 14., from the *empire of death*, which "reigned even over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" that is to say, over INFANTS, who cannot be said to have sinned actually as Adam did.'‡

Turretin, then, one of the very highest of all Calvinistic authorities, was a believer in actual infant damnation, and that too, 'as quoted by the reviewer.' We will add one passage more, however, though we think it superfluous. He is speaking to the question whether there be any such thing as original sin, and gives the opinions of various 'heretics' who held to the negative. He mentions, and of course condemns, the doctrines of—

*Institut. Theol. P. I. p. 681. † Ibid. p. 698. ‡ Ibid. p. 683.

1st—'The ancient Pelagians, who, having followed as their master, Pelagius the Briton, denied original sin in all its parts, contending that the sin of Adam hurt nobody but himself, or, if it should be said to have injured anybody else, that it was through example or imitation, not by propagation.——2d. The Socinians, who, although they acknowledge in all a power to sin, because God gave them a will free to choose either good or evil, yet expressly deny that there is any original sin.—— 3d. Not unlike them are the Remonstrants, who, in their Apology, pronounce it certain, *whatever Augustin and others may have determined to the contrary*, that God will appoint, and that he, on account of original sin so called, with justice can appoint to ETERNAL TORMENTS, NO INFANTS, of whatever lot or descent, dying without actual and personal sins, [holding] that this opinion,' viz. that any infants will be appointed to eternal torments, 'is opposed to the divine goodness and right reason, nay, that it is uncertain whether the preponderance is in favor of its absurdity or its cruelty. Curcellæus openly *denies* the same, in Dissert. 2, On Original Sin.——4th. Among the Roman Catholics, Pighius and Catharinus restrict original sin to imputation alone, denying its propagation. The Anabaptists, following the steps of the former, call original sin *Augustin's figment.* But to *all these*, THE ORTHODOX CHURCH *has* ALWAYS *opposed herself, and* CONSTANTLY *held the affirmative.*'*

Here, let it be observed, Turretin speaks not only for himself, but also for the 'Orthodox Church,' or, as Dr Beecher has it, 'the churches denominated Calvinistic,' which Turretin tells us have 'ALWAYS,' and Dr Beecher tells us have 'NEVER' held the doctrine of infant damnation. Turretin was unquestionably a man of profound learning; but whether he or Dr Beecher is upon that score the more likely to be correct on the point so completely at issue between them, is a question, upon which we, certainly, shall not venture to express an opinion. We must be content, for the present, with remarking, that a doctrine acknowledged and taught as a part of their system, by Calvin and Turretin, must be a Calvinistic doctrine, and, so far as that point is concerned, we might consider the controversy as at an end here. But the damnation of infants was not a belief peculiar to Calvin or Calvinists. It had been adopted by the Roman Catholic Church for ages, and the Reformers are not exclusively entitled to the praise of giving this last finish to their doctrines of predestination and original sin. They had become familiar with its horrors in the common belief of that church, that such as die without baptism, including of course all heathen infants, have nothing to save them from hell, or at least from future punishment somewhere. Though most Protestants at last dissented from the church they abandoned, in denying the necessity of this rite to salvation, the damnation of infants was, nevertheless, held to be a necessary consequence of their guiltiness by nature

* Instit. Theol. P. I. pp. 694, 695.

and reprobation by God. The Catholics, in the superabundance of their compassion, had provided a *limbus infantum*, a place reserved especially for these little ones, in which they were to suffer something less than the full torments of hell—a notion, which was ridiculed by the Protestants, who, in more perfect consistency, as will soon be seen, with Augustin, the common authority of both parties, held that there are but two places for all who are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, a heaven and a hell—the one on the right hand, the other on the left of the Judge, and that such as are not admitted to the former, must necessarily take up their abode in the latter. This, we are persuaded, has been the belief of Calvinists of all former ages, and, unless upon this point too they have deserted the Westminster Assembly, it is also the faith of Calvinists of the present day.

The thought of there being infants in hell, did not, therefore, originate with the Reformation, or with Calvin and his followers. For centuries it had been deemed, what Turretin asserts it to be, a heresy to deny the truth of the doctrine. Augustin, especially, after the commencement of his controversy with the Pelagians, was so distinguished for the earnestness and perseverance with which he maintained it, that *durus pater infantum*, the hard father of infants, became an appellation of him as notorious as the fact that he is also the father of Calvinism. It was because of this last circumstance alone, however, that we introduced his name into this controversy. But Dr Beecher seems not to be aware—he certainly does not give its just weight to the fact—that Calvin's doctrines of original sin and irrespective decrees, from which infant damnation is the inevitable and acknowledged result, differ in no essential respect from Augustin's, so that, as observed in our review, a quotation from Augustin on either of these doctrines, and upon many others, is as good an evidence of what Calvinism is, as a quotation from Calvin himself. Calvin, we say, took his doctrines of predestination and original sin from Augustin, and if Augustin believed, and stated it to be a consequence of those doctrines, that certain infants will inevitably be damned, it is a fact, which, to say the least of it, must go far to prevent our surprise at finding a similar or even a worse position maintained by his follower. Now it is certainly more honorable, or rather it is less discreditable to Dr Beecher, to suppose him utterly ignorant of this well known relationship between the systems of Calvin and Augustin, than to imagine he knew of it, and yet could ridicule an argument founded upon it, of which that knowledge would render it impossible for him to question the soundness. We shall, therefore,

allow that our learned author was not aware of what is so familiar to the most superficially instructed in the history of theological opinions, and proceed to expose the grounds on which he has presumed to speak of the sentiments of a writer, whom the Letters before us afford us no evidence that he has ever even looked into. After his remarks upon our quotations from Calvin and Turretin, which, in our estimation, left him *absque remedio*, without a word to say, Dr Beecher, not in the manner of the grave and learned divine that he is, but in a mode of writing in which it is difficult to say which character predominates, that of the warrior, the lawyer, or the sophist, goes on as follows;—

'And now, elated by such a victory, in true Bonapartean style, he follows us up in our discomfiture, to make an end of us, by pouring in upon us the testimony of AUGUSTINE, a man who lived some ten centuries before Calvin was born, in order to prove that the Calvinists of New England and the United States, between whom and Augustine fifteen centuries have intervened, do believe, nevertheless, that infants are damned. This is the greatest march of mind that I have met with in these marching days; the most fearless act of mental agility, I cannot but think, ever attempted,—to make the premises and conclusion leap a ditch of fifteen centuries to come together. Now let us see how they succeed. At two leaps it is done. "Calvin thought highly of Augustine, and constantly (often) cited him as the highest authority; therefore, on the subject of infant damnation, Calvin must have believed as Augustine did. But Calvinists of the present day think highly of Calvin, and often quote him as the highest authority; therefore, they believe, on the subject of infant damnation, as Calvin believed."

'Now then for the syllogism: He that highly esteems and almost constantly quotes an author as of the very highest authority, must be supposed to believe exactly as he does on all points, &c.' pp. 87, 88.

So much for the sophist and the warrior—'so they play their parts.' Next the lawyer comes upon the stage, and addresses us in the words we have before quoted;—

'Now if we were in a court of justice, we should be permitted to cross-question these witnesses. And, as a "deep stain" is likely to be fixed on our character, should we be convicted, I know not why legal evidence should not be demanded. I would take the liberty, therefore, to ask John Calvin a few questions.

Dr Beecher. 'Has your high estimation of Augustine led you anywhere to avow, that you believed in every sentiment which he taught?

John Calvin. 'Never.' p. 88.

We, in our turn, would ask Dr Beecher, where the reviewer has ever intimated his belief of so silly a proposition, as that because one writer thinks highly of another, their sentiments must therefore be the same on *all* points? Our argument, he well knew, related only to the doctrines of predestination and original sin, and we contended that a certain inference from those doctrines, had been expressly admitted by both of the

writers in question. But be this as it may, Dr Beecher proceeds with his cross-examination, and, after obtaining the answer from Calvin, which we have shown to be directly contradicted by his writings, says ;—

'We would now put a few questions also to Augustine.

Dr Beecher. 'Did you, Sir, believe and teach that infants are damned; meaning by the term damnation, what it is now in common use understood to mean—a condition of excessive and unmingled suffering, bodily and mental?

'Aug. Horresco! Nunquam, nunquam. Dixi "Contra Julianum, lib. i. cap. 16. Potest proinde recte dici parvulos sine baptismo de corpore exeuntes in damnatione omnium mitissime futuros;" et lib. v. cap. 8, dixi "Ego non dico parvulos sine baptismo Christi morientes, tanta pœna esse plectendos ut eis non nasci potius expediret." Miror! Indignor! O tempora! O mores!*

'You see, Sir, how Augustine feels at your misrepresentation of him—as if he taught that infants were sent to the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell;" when what he taught in fact was, the damnation of infants as consisting chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of that holy enjoyment in heaven for which their depravity disqualified them; and if they suffered a positive evil at all, it was of the very mildest kind; and such as rendered their eternal existence, on the whole, a blessing. A state much happier than that in which thousands and millions of infants have lived in this world; for there have been multitudes so circumstanced in time as that their existence was no blessing to them. And yet this sentiment of Augustine you have quoted to prove that Calvin believed, and that those who are called by his name, now believe, that infants not a span long are sent to the fierce torments of an eternal hell! And it is after such splendid exhibitions of knowledge in ecclesiastical history, and of skill in translation, and accuracy in reasoning, that the reviewer celebrates his triumph, &c.' pp. 88, 89.

Here, as we mean to show, Dr Beecher charges us with misrepresenting a writer, with whose sentiments on the point in question he is at the same time giving proof incontestible that he of himself knows absolutely nothing. In the first place, he did not take the two quotations he has mixed up with Latin of his own, directly from Augustin. He took them from Ridgley's Body of Divinity. Or, if he did not take them from that work, he must have taken them either from some one who did, or from some one from whom Ridgley himself took them. At all

'* I am horror struck! Never, never. I said in my book, Contra Julianum, lib. i. cap. 16, "It may, therefore, be truly said, that infants, departing from the body without being baptized, will be in a condemnation of all most mild;" and in lib. v. cap. 8, I have said, "I do not say that infants, dying without Christian baptism, will be filled with such punishment as will make it expedient rather that they had never been born." I am astonished—I am indignant—that I should be represented as having taught that infants suffer the full torments of hell. Oh, the degeneracy of the times!'—It is in this passage, it will be perceived, that our learned critic upon *absque remedio* and the importance of 'collocation,' as a means of elucidating Latin sentences, gives us his *damnation emitissime*, and his 'filled with punishment,' for *pœnâ plectendos*.

events, he did not take them directly from Augustin. In the Body of Divinity they stand in a note, thus;—

'*See *Aug.* contra Julianum, *Lib.* V. *cap.* 8. Ego non dico, parvulos sine baptismo Christi morientes tantâ pœnâ esse plectendos, ut eis non nasci potius expediret. Et *Ejus.* de peccat. merit. et remiss. *Lib.* I. *cap.* 16. Potest proinde rectè dici, parvulos sine baptismo de corpore exeuntes, in damnatione omnium mitissimâ futuros.'*

Now if the reader will compare these citations as given by Ridgley, with the same as given by Dr Beecher, he will perceive that, except in punctuation, of which Dr Beecher is habitually careless, and his *mitissime* for *mitissimâ*, accounted for in our last number, they are in all respects precisely alike. This circumstance, we allow, is in itself nothing to our purpose, because the accordance admits of explanation on the ground that Ridgley and Dr. Beecher both copied immediately from Augustin. But it so happens that both writers have fallen into the same mistake of transcription, both giving us *baptismo Christi* for *Christi baptismate*, as it stands in every edition of Augustin we have examined. † Besides, Ridgley refers, for one of the quotations, to *Lib.* V. *cap.* 8, where the words do not occur, instead of *Lib.* V. *cap.* 11, where they are to be found, and Dr Beecher, much to our inconvenience, adopted his error. Nor is this all. In order to conceal his plagiarism, our author, who is 'not disposed to stand about trifles,' was at the pains of transposing the quotations, so that the one which Ridgley put first, is by him put last, and *vice versâ*. But in doing this, he unfortunately committed a blunder, which only the more completely discovers what he was endeavouring to hide. For Ridgley, except in giving *cap.* 8. for *cap.* 11., made his references correctly. But Dr Beecher, in transposing the citations, dropped the *title* of the *Lib.* I. to which Ridgley had referred him, and put the quotation from that book under the title of the *Lib.* V. to which Ridgley had referred him, so that he gives us a reference to the *sixteenth* chapter of the first book of Augustin *Against Julian*, when, if our learned author had looked into the original, he might have seen, that *nine* chapters are all which that book contains. This is bad enough, but, worse still, we are referred to Augustin's work *Against Julian*, for a passage which was in fact taken, by Ridgley, from his work *Concerning the Deserts*

* Ridgley's Body of Divinity, vol. i. Quest. xxvii. p. 345. Ed. 1731.

† Ridgley also gives us *Ego non dico*, instead of *Ego autem non dico*, as Augustin wrote it. This, however, was done designedly, because *autem* refers to something Augustin had before said, which Ridgley did not wish to notice. Dr Beecher has also omitted the same word, but, since he may have had the same reason for it, we have made no account of the circumstance.

and Remission of Sin,—an awkwardness which our author might have avoided, had he implicitly followed his guide, instead of attempting to appear to have made his discoveries by his own independent researches. However, the circumstances we have detailed, when taken together, demonstrate, to our minds, that Dr Beecher, although he speaks of the sentiments of Augustin with an assurance evidently intended to pass with his readers for the confidence of truth, has, in so far as his quotations are concerned, given us no proof whatever, that he has ever looked into the works of that father, not to speak of the conclusive evidence they afford to the contrary. Having himself spoken of our 'splendid exhibitions of knowledge in ecclesiastical history,' he will doubtless thank us for returning the compliment, in thus pointing out his.

Such, then, is the controvertist, who charges us with intentional misquotation and mistranslation, with speaking of the sentiments of a writer with 'unauthorised confidence,' and a pitiful conspiracy 'to put out the only light to redeem a certain passage from perversion;' who 'follows us through our windings,' 'exposes our ignorance and weakness,' 'writes to apprize us of what we ought to have known long since,' compassionately tells us how we 'might have escaped the downfall, into which we have so heedlessly plunged,' and, in conclusion, animadverts upon 'such instances of moral obliquity,' as our charging Calvin, Turretin, and others, with believing in the damnation of infants—a charge, which, says this indignant vindicator of the 'holy dead,' 'is UTTERLY FALSE; and, [not] KNOWING it to be such, *I* have publicly denied it!'

But, to return to our argument, Dr Beecher discovers just as familiar an acquaintance with the works of Augustin, by what he says 'he in fact taught,' as by the mode in which he came by his two quotations from that author. Indeed we strongly suspect, though we of course shall not affirm, that he took both comment and text from the very same source. At all events, the doctrine he ascribes to Augustin, is precisely that laid down in Ridgley's Body of Divinity, as will be seen when we produce that 'approved Calvinistic writer,' as an authority for the future punishment of infants. Ridgley saw, most clearly, that infant damnation, in some shape, clung inseparably to the Calvinistic system. But he was probably one of the 'two dissenting divines,' who were thought by Edwards to have virtually given up a cardinal point of Calvinism, in hesitating to make thorough work of it, and consign the little masses of corruption to the full torments of hell. He was a Calvinist, but his humanity struggled

hard with his love of consistency, and so far got the mastery, as to induce him to soften, as well as he might, the rigors of his system, though it could not persuade him wholly to abandon its unnatural dogmas. Guilty as they were in Adam, he dared not deny that the little babes would hereafter be punished; but he hoped it would be gently, that God would not cast them into eternal fires, that 'their damnation,' to use Dr Beecher's excellent summary of his doctrine, 'would consist chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of that holy enjoyment in heaven, for which their depravity disqualified them, and if they suffered a positive evil at all, that it would be of the very mildest kind, and such as would render their eternal existence on the whole a blessing.' Such was Ridgley's doctrine, and we could not have had, in so narrow a compass, a fairer or fuller representation of it, than Dr Beecher has himself given us in these words. But what was the doctrine of Augustin? Did *he* make it a question, whether infants would 'suffer a positive evil at all,' or hold that their 'damnation would consist chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of holy enjoyment in heaven,' or did he, on the contrary, 'send them to the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell?"' That he excluded such as have not been baptized, from heaven, although they might die in such circumstances as rendered their baptism impossible, we have already shown in our review; and this, we did think, would be enough to satisfy any Calvinist, that he must have consigned them to hell. But Dr Beecher tells us it did not satisfy him, and he thinks the two quotations he picked up in Ridgley, abundantly prove that we have made an unauthorised use of that father's name. For, 'Did you, Sir,' says he to Augustin, *did* you 'believe and teach that infants are damned, meaning by the term damnation—a condition of excessive and unmingled suffering, *bodily* and mental?' 'Never,' is the word Dr Beecher gets in reply, and then, in support of his denial, we are offered Augustin's 'mildest damnation of all.' But what a pitiful attempt at evasion have we here! Because Augustin believed the damnation of infants would be of the mildest kind, therefore we have misrepresented him in saying, that he believed infants would be damned—though this, as Dr Beecher well knew, was all we said, or meant to say, or were required by our argument to prove! Why, if our author, so learned in the doctrines of the Fathers, had but looked into the original for one of his own quotations, he would have seen that Augustin himself, in the same breath in which he utters the words that were cited by Ridgley, gives his *reader* a caution against the very perversion of his language of which Dr Beecher has been guilty;—

'It may therefore be truly said, that infants dying without baptism, will be in a state of damnation of all the most mild. But,' Augustin immediately adds, 'GREATLY DOES HE DECEIVE and *is he deceived*, who affirms that they *will not be damned*.'*

In connexion with the second quotation, Augustin tells us that even some baptized infants will be damned. His opponent, it seems, had compared parents to homicides, in that they were the occasion of bringing their children into a state of damnation. But, said Augustin, the same reproach may with greater justice be cast upon the goodness of God—

'who is certainly the author of all good, and yet does not refrain from creating those whom he foreknew were to BURN IN ETERNAL FIRES; nor is anything but goodness imputed to him, because he creates them. And even some BAPTIZED INFANTS, whom he foreknew would prove apostates, he does not take out of this life and adopt into his eternal kingdom, nor confer upon them the great blessing granted to him of whom it is said, "Speedily was he taken away, lest that wickedness should alter his understanding."'†

He then contends, that parents are even less to blame than God, because they do not foreknow what the fate of their children is to be, which cannot be said in excuse of the Deity, and goes on to notice another objection to continuing the species, arising from the saying of our Saviour, 'That it had been better for that man if he had never been born.' To this he replies, that his being born was more the act of God than of his parents, and argues, as before, from the foreknowledge of God, and the parents' ignorance of futurity. Then follows Ridgley's first, or Dr Beecher's second quotation, in these words;—

'But I do not say that infants dying without christian baptism, will have so great a punishment inflicted upon them that it would be better for them if they had never been born; since the Lord,' Augustin adds, 'has said this, not of sinners in general, *de quibuslibet peccatoribus*, but of the most wicked and abandoned. For if, as he says of the Sodomites, and surely did not wish to have understood of them alone, some will at the day of judgment be punished more endurably than others, who will doubt but that unbaptized infants, who have no sin but original, and are not burdened with any of their own, will be in a state of damnation the lightest of all? Which, although *I cannot define what or how great* it will be, yet I dare not say that it would be better for them not to exist than to be there. But even you,' he says, 'who contend that they are exempt from all damnation, do not like to think with what a damnation you punish them, by alienating so many of God's images from the life of God and the kingdom of God.'‡

It seems, then, that Augustin, in the context of Ridgley's first

* De Peccat. Merit. et Remiss. Lib. I. c. 16.
† Contra Julianum, Lib. V. c. 10. ‡Ibid. cap. 11.

quotation, which is the one we have last noticed, *opposes* the very doctrine which Dr Beecher asserts 'he in fact taught;' viz. that 'the damnation of infants consists chiefly, *if not entirely*, in the loss of holy enjoyment in heaven,' while, in immediate connexion with Ridgley's second quotation, he says, that he is DECEIVED and IS A DECEIVER, who denies the doctrine of infant damnation. This, surely, is enough for our object, and we could not have asked for a quotation more directly to our purpose. So far, then, we do not 'see' that Augustin 'feels' either displeasure or surprise 'at our misrepresentation of him.' In connexion with one of the passages to which Ridgley and Dr Beecher have referred us, he even goes further than he did in that which we quoted, and says, not only that all unbaptized infants, but also that some baptized infants will be damned.

Let us next 'see how Augustin feels at our misrepresentation of him—as if he taught that infants were sent to the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell"'—a thing, by the by, which Dr Beecher is aware that we have never yet expressly *said* that he taught, though we do say it now, and prove it by the following quotation, in which he opposes, still more directly than in the last, the doctrine, which Dr Beecher seems to have thought must have been Augustin's doctrine, for no better reason than because Ridgley happened to find in the works of that father, a couple of expressions which described a particular feature of his own belief. The 'hard father of infants' is still combating the 'heresy,' as Turretin and all Calvinists call it, of Pelagius and his followers, and writes thus;—

'We affirm, that they [infants] will not be saved, and have eternal life, except they be baptized in Christ. * * * An infant, *they say*, although he may not be baptized, yet on account of his innocence, in that he is wholly without sin, whether personal or original, whether of himself or derived from Adam, such an one, say they, must necessarily be saved and have eternal life, although he may not be baptized; but he is therefore to be baptized, that he may enter even into the kingdom of God, that is, into the kingdom of heaven. * * * When they say, that they [infants] are not to be baptized for the sake of receiving salvation and eternal life, but only for entrance into the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God,—they indeed confess that they ought to be baptized, but not on account of eternal life, but for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. What do they say of eternal life? They shall have it, say they. Wherefore shall they have it? Because they have no sin, and cannot belong to the number of the damned, *ad damnationem pertinere non possunt.* Therefore,' says Augustin, 'there is eternal life out of the kingdom of heaven!

'This first error must be refused admittance to your ears, must be rooted out of your minds. This new doctrine, that there is eternal life independent of the kingdom of heaven, that there is eternal salvation independent of the kingdom of God, was never before heard of in the church. First, see, brother, whether perchance you ought not hence to agree

with us, that whosoever does not belong to the kingdom of God, must, without doubt, belong to the number of the damned. The Lord will come, and, about to judge the living and the dead, will, according to the gospel, make two divisions, the right and the left. To those on the left he will say, *Depart into* EVERLASTING FIRE *prepared for the devil and his angels.* To those on the right, he will say, *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom which was prepared for you from the foundation of the world.* The one he calls a kingdom, the other damnation with the devil. THERE IS NO MIDDLE PLACE LEFT, WHERE YOU CAN PUT INFANTS. * * * Behold, on the right is the kingdom of heaven. *Inherit*, he says, *the kingdom.* He who is not there, is on the left. What will happen on the left? *Depart into everlasting fire.* On the right, an eternal kingdom; on the left, everlasting fire. He that is not on the right, will indisputably be on the left. Therefore *he that is not in the kingdom,* IS DOUBTLESS IN ETERNAL FIRE. Certainly he cannot have eternal life, who is not baptized; he will not be on the right, that is, he will not be in the kingdom. * * * In his [the Lord's] last sentence, that he might teach what is the kingdom, and what eternal fire, he says, [Matt. xxv. 46,] *Then these shall go away into everlasting burning, but the righteous into life eternal.*

'Behold, he [the Lord] has explained to you what is the kingdom, and what is everlasting fire, so that when you confess that an infant will not be in the kingdom, you may allow that HE WILL BE IN ETERNAL FIRE. * * *

'I feel that this question is a profound one, and I own that my powers are not sufficient to fathom its depths. I must here be content to exclaim with Paul, *O the depth of the riches!* AN UNBAPTIZED INFANT GOES TO DAMNATION.'*

This, then, is Augustin's way of representing 'the damnation of infants as consisting chiefly, if not entirely, in the loss of that holy enjoyment in heaven for which their depravity disqualified them.' There has indeed been a wonderful 'change of views and language' taking place in these days, and when things are called by their right names, we shall expect to hear of a sect of Pelagian Calvinists, as the result of Dr Beecher's learned labors upon Ridgley's Body of Divinity. This 'splendid exhibition' of logic and learning, reminds us of Benedict Turretin's remarks upon a similar one by Father Coton, the Jesuit. 'St Augustin,' says Turretin, 'has rigorously condemned all infants dying without baptism, not only to such a punishment as the schoolmen imagine, but a much worse. What is more, he combats their distinction, opposing the Pelagians, who said that the privation of baptism excluded them from the kingdom of heaven, but did not lock them up in hell. Who would not laugh at an argument like this? Augustin holds, "that infants dying without baptism, *are punished with the punishment of* ETERNAL FIRE," De Fide, ad Pet. cap. 27, and Coton would infer a hell, where there is no punishment of *sense*, but only that of *loss*. *What sense has Coton*, to think of prov-

* De Baptismo Parvulorum contra Pelagianos. Sermo D. August. xiv. capp. 2, 3, 4, and 7.

ing that they will have no punishment of *sense*, by the authority of him who condemns them to the *punishment of fire?* If Coton were in the fire, in what kind of punishment would he be there? that of *sense* or of *loss?*' * So too, if consigning infants to everlasting burnings, is not consigning them 'to the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell,"' we should be glad to be told what is. Till Dr Beecher has shown that it is not, however, we must believe that we have demonstrated what we attempted to prove; viz. that he has in these Letters given us no evidence that he ever even looked into the works of Augustin which he pretends to quote, and that his own attempt to neutralize the authority of that father as a believer in infant damnation, is not only a total failure, but a failure, which, let it do him what honor it may as a man, certainly reflects upon him no credit whatever as a scholar. This is plain language, it is true; but if any one is disposed to blame us for using it, let him reflect that he hears but the plain language of FACTS before him, and that it is therefore not we, but Dr Beecher, who should be held accountable for its character, even were it much plainer than we have yet made it to be.

It would be easy to produce other ancient authorities for the doctrine in question, but we shall quote but one more, that of Fulgentius, who was born about forty years after Augustin died, and was a theologian of the same school. There is a raciness about his expressions, which is worthy of the great perfecter of the system, Calvin himself. He frequently, and with the utmost unconcern, speaks of God's condemning infants to 'eternal damnation,' 'eternal torments,' 'eternal burning,' &c.; but there is one passage, which, except in making baptism absolutely necessary to salvation, gives us so exactly the genuine Calvinistic doctrine on this subject, that we shall content ourselves with giving that alone. In one of his works, he gives a catalogue of Orthodox articles of faith, beginning each of the forty 'heads' of which it consists, with the words *Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites*, 'most firmly hold, and by no means doubt.' The passage to which we refer, makes one of the forty, and is as follows;—

'Most firmly hold, and by no means doubt, not only that men who have come to the use of reason, but also that INFANTS, whether they begin to live in their mothers' wombs *and there die*, or, after being born, pass from this life without the sacrament of holy baptism, which is given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, WILL BE PUNISHED WITH THE EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT OF ETERNAL FIRE; because, although they had no sin of their own committing, they have nevertheless incurred, by their carnal conception and nativity, the damnation of original sin.' †

* Defense de la Fidelité des Traductions de la S. Bible faites à Geneve. Par B. Turrettin. Verification xli.

† Fulgentius de Fide ad Pet. Diac. cap. xxvii.

This, we say, excepting what relates to baptism, is genuine Calvinism. For it is human nature itself, the created living mass, which is odious and abominable to God, and no matter whether it has existed for years or only for an instant, it is equally hateful in the eyes of its Creator, its sinfulness is still total, and it is therefore equally deserving of unspeakable torments in hell fire forever. We shall not stop to prove by quotations from Calvin, that he, like Fulgentius, did not think it necessary that the infant should be born in order to be damnable; for the fact is well known. The citations we have already made from his works establish it beyond a question, and it is from this part of his doctrine, undoubtedly, that the traditional expression that 'there are infants in hell not a span long,' has arisen. Whether it has ever been adopted by Calvinists, or is only an expression used by their opponents to set their 'horrible decree' in a striking light, we do not pretend to determine. That it is an expression, which ought not to shock any consistent, thorough Calvinist, we are sure. But this is a departure from the course we promised to pursue, which requires us, before producing additional authorities, to reexamine those we originally cited.

Our next quotations were made, with the single exception of Twiss,* from 'approved Calvinistic writers' of a later date. These, with his usual accuracy, Dr Beecher supposes were contained in Professor Norton's views of Calvinism, a work which our author tells us he has lately 'read, with a full purpose, if such quotations as he [the reviewer] alleges, were contained in it, to admit frankly his mistake.' But, if Dr Beecher has read it, will he 'frankly' explain to us, how he could suppose it contained our *quotations* from later *writers*, when the fact is, that only one out of the four is to be found in its pages? This, for aught we know, may be a 'trifle;' but Dr Beecher should have remembered, that, while bringing against us a charge of 'falsehood,' it became him, of all men, to be extremely careful that 'trifles' like these, should not be of such frequent occurrence. The later authority for which we were indebted to the Views of Calvinism, was that of Edwards; a writer, whose sentiments, as Dr Beecher contends, we have as grossly misrepresented as we did those of Augustin, Calvin, and Turretin. For once we are glad we have an opportunity to establish the correctness, instead of

* The language of our review implies that Twiss, who died in 1646, was a later writer than Turretin, who died in 1687. We also gave a wrong translation of the title of Twiss's 'Vindication of the Grace, Power, and Providence of God.' We were led into the mistake by the title having been incorrectly printed in the Christian Disciple, from which we copied.

exposing the errors, of our author, and we shall endeavour to show that Edwards was no more, but just as much, of a believer in infant damnation as the writers just mentioned. Let us first quote all that Dr Beecher has said in relation to Edwards, as he was cited in our review. It is as follows;—

'Especially do I call for the proof that EDWARDS gives up infants to "the full torments of hell." The passage quoted from Edwards in proof contains no such sentiment. He is replying to two "dissenting divines, of no inconsiderable note," one of whom supposed that only so much sin of Adam was imputed, as justified the miseries of this life, and of death, or annihilation; the other supposing that no imputation can be consistent with the divine perfections which avers that the future state of infants should be worse than nonexistence.

'"But this to me," he says, "appears plainly to be giving up that grand point of the imputation of Adam's sin, both in whole and in part. For it supposes it to be not right for God to bring any evil on a child of Adam, which is innocent as to personal sin, without paying for it, or balancing it with good; so that still the state of the child shall be as good as could be demanded in justice, in case of mere innocence. Which plainly supposes that the child is not exposed to any proper punishment at all, or is not at all in debt to divine justice, on account of Adam's sin." *

'But, in this passage, what does Edwards say? Simply and only, as all the Reformers had said, that infants are *exposed* justly to eternal death on account of original sin; but that they *suffer* this deserved punishment HE DOES NOT SAY. And yet, such is the authority which the reviewer claims, as "directly and completely to his purpose," to prove that Edwards gave up infants to the torments of hell.'—pp. 89, 90.

Of what 'the Reformers said' we shall speak more fully hereafter, it being enough to remark here, that Dr Beecher shows himself but superficially, if at all, acquainted with their belief on this subject. With regard to Edwards, we grant that in the passage we quoted, which is that given by Dr Beecher, he *does not expressly say*, that infants must suffer the 'torments of hell;' but that he believed it, is a conclusion irresistibly forced upon us by his reasoning in that passage and the context, and we must therefore still be permitted to claim him as an authority 'directly and completely to our purpose.' And here we are compelled to remark, that Dr Beecher's mode of conducting this controversy, is, throughout, more like that of a man intent upon beating down his adversary, than of one anxious to establish the truth. For what if Edwards does not *expressly say*, that infants must be eternally punished in hell fire? The question is not about what he has *said*, but what he *believed*, and this can be made as evident in a course of reasoning without a direct expression of it, as by the plainest and most unqualified assertions. Instead of letting the matter rest upon his bare denial, therefore,

* 'Edwards on Original Sin. Works, vol. vi. p. 462.'

it would have evinced a greater desire to come to the real truth in the case, if Dr Beecher had given us an analysis of the whole course of Edwards's reasoning in the context, and shown, in his favorite 'logical form,' that it conducts a fair minded man to no such conclusion as that for which we have contended. But, what is worse, he does not even attempt to show that the ground is untenable, on which Professor Norton, in the extract we made from him, produced Edwards at all, as an authority in this question. That ground was, that Edwards *opposed* the belief of 'some more tender-hearted Calvinists,' that the 'future condition,' the *actual* future condition of infants, not the condition they were *exposed* to, 'would not be worse than non-existence.' Edwards, we say, *opposed* this doctrine, because, among other reasons, it implies that '*the state* of the child *shall be* as good as could be demanded in justice in case of mere innocence.' The conclusion is therefore inevitable, that he must himself have believed in a future 'state of the child,' NOT 'as good as could be demanded in justice in case of mere innocence,' and we shall soon see that that 'worse state than non-existence,' was, in his view, a state of 'PERFECT AND ETERNAL MISERY.' The distinction of which Dr Beecher speaks, between a liability or just exposure to punishment, and its actual infliction, is neither insisted upon, nor even noticed, either by Edwards or the 'two divines' upon whose theories he is remarking. On the contrary, one of them believed that infants would actually be annihilated at death, and the other, that they would, after death, actually be punished, though not so severely as to 'make their state in another world *worse* than non-existence.' The first was Watts, and the second Ridgley, as already mentioned. Neither of them believed all infants would be saved, neither of them believed *any* would be saved except they were children of believers, and one of them, Ridgley, thought it unreasonable to suppose all of the latter description would be saved. They are, therefore, both of them, good authorities against Dr Beecher on this subject; but, on the ground that they do not go far enough, they are both opposed by Edwards, who, in regard to the theory of Watts, has the following remarks;—

'I would observe, that to suppose, God imputes not all the guilt of Adam's sin, but only some little part of it, relieves nothing but one's imagination. To think of poor little infants bearing such torments for Adam's sin, as they sometimes do in this world, and these torments ending in death and annihilation, may sit easier on the imagination, than to conceive of their SUFFERING ETERNAL MISERY for it. But it does not at all relieve one's reason. There is no rule of reason that can be supposed to lie against imputing a sin in the whole of it, which was com-

mitted by one, to another who did not personally commit it, but what will also lie against its being so imputed and *punished* in part.'*

Now it does seem to us impossible that any one could have written this paragraph, in the circumstances in which Edwards wrote it, unless he were a believer in the doctrine that infants are given up to the full torments of hell. He had been replying to 'that great objection against the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity—that such imputation is unjust and unreasonble, inasmuch as Adam and his posterity are not one and the same.' In the course of his remarks, he had said, that 'things were wisely so established, that all should naturally be in one and the same moral state; and not in such exceeding different states, as that some should be—in a confirmed state of perfect happiness, but others in a state of public condemnation to *perfect and eternal misery*'—which latter is the condition into which he believed all mankind were brought by Adam's sin. Having removed the 'great objection' abovementioned, he thought it 'not improper to add something—concerning the opinions of two divines, of no inconsiderable note among the Dissenters in England, relating to a partial imputation of Adam's first sin.'

'One of them,' [Watts] he says, 'supposes that this sin, though truly imputed to INFANTS, so that thereby they are exposed to a proper punishment, yet is not imputed to them in such a degree, as that upon this account they should be liable to eternal punishment, as Adam himself was, but only to temporal death, or annihilation; Adam himself, the immediate actor, being made infinitely more guilty by it, than his posterity.' †

Here, it is true, he uses the words 'exposed' and 'liable;' but he uses them in a way which shows that the distinction upon which Dr Beecher insists, was not in his mind. For not only does Watts, against whom he is writing, make no such distinction, but, as we have already remarked, he believed in the *actual infliction* of the 'proper punishment' of which Edwards speaks. Besides, in this same sentence, in which Edwards talks of infants' liability to 'eternal punishment,' he also speaks of their liability to 'temporal death.' But will Dr Beecher be consistent with himself, and to the question, 'What, in this passage, does Edwards say?' return the answer, 'Simply and only—that infants are *exposed* justly to temporal death; but that they *suffer* this deserved punishment HE DOES NOT SAY?' Yet if Edwards used the words loosely, and without reference to Dr Beecher's distinction, in the one case, why may he not have done so in the other? If, consistently with his convictions of the truth, he could

* Edwards's Works, vol. vi. p. 461. † Ibid. p. 460.

have availed himself of that distinction, he had not only a fair opportunity, but was even called upon to do it. For Watts, in his 'Advertisement' to the work in which he maintains the doctrine of infant annihilation, says;—

'I have endeavoured throughout this whole composure to *relieve and soften* all the harsher, and more obnoxious parts of this doctrine of original sin, and several other articles of our religion dependent upon it.' And again;—'I have also ventured to preclude, or to cut off some of the harder and more offensive consequences that have been *often* drawn or forced from these articles. It is evident that these points have been sometimes carried into extremes, and the explication of them has not always been well limited and guarded.'*

One of these 'harsher and more obnoxious,' or 'harder and more offensive' consequences, doubtless was, the Calvinistic doctrine that infants dying in their 'lost estate by nature,' are punished 'in hell fire forever.' Watts could not but acknowledge that the impossibility of their salvation was the natural and inevitable result of his Calvinistic principles. But how earnestly and touchingly does he plead for their rescue from that intense and everlasting anguish, to which a rigid interpretation of his system would consign them!

'In the mean time, while they are deemed infants, and have no personal sin, or obedience of their own, but only lie under the sentence of death for the sin of Adam, so far as it is imputed to them, let us not send any of their little souls into a separate state of torment, as soon as death has seized their bodies, without an express divine warrant: Nor let us raise up their bodies again from the dead, and then doom them, soul and body, to intense anguish and everlasting fire and sorrow, merely for Adam's sin, unless we can find some very evident sentence of this kind passed upon them in the word of God. The equity and the compassion of a God, so far as we can judge of it by the light of reason, would not inflict so severe and eternal a punishment on these little creatures, who are personally innocent or free from actual sin: And unless we can find some divine revelation that pronounces it with great strength and evidence, let us not so far contradict the gentler dictates of nature and reason, as to assert this opinion for truth, nor impose it on our own belief, nor on the belief of others. Let us try then, whether we cannot find out some milder punishment for their share of the guilt of Adam, in the bible.'†

Again;—

'They cannot suffer any self-reproaches for sin, for they have committed none: Nor can this be conveyed to them by any imputed guilt of Adam, though it is a very great part of the punishment of souls for actual sin, as being the natural effect of personal transgression and guilt. If therefore they are punished for Adam's sin in another world, it must probably be by actual pains and torments inflicted on them by God himself, since the most natural effects of sin, that is, guilt and anguish of conscience, cannot reach them: And is it agreeable to the nature and mercy of a God to inflict such positive and endless pains or torments with his

* Ruin and Recovery of Mankind, Advertisement concerning the Sec. Ed.
† Ibid. Quest. xvi.

own hand, on such little creatures, who are free from all personal iniquity, and have no other crime but that they were born of Adam ?' *

In another place he writes as follows;—

'If I may freely speak my own sentiments here, I would say, since neither reason nor scripture, certainly and plainly teach us anything concerning the souls of the infants of wicked men after death; and if I must not leave them in a state of non-existence, I would much rather chuse to suppose them at the death of the body entered into a new and personal state of trial, than I would condemn them to a wretched resurrection and eternal misery for nothing else, but because they were born of Adam, the original transgressor.' *

'Upon the whole, the opinion of the salvation of all children, as it has no countenance from the bible, *so it has no foundation in the reason of things.* * * * The scripture brings down the infants of wicked parents to the grave, and leaves them there, and so do I: The scripture has not provided any resurrection for them, neither can I do it.' *

Watts, therefore, as remarked above, is a good authority against Dr Beecher for the actual future punishment of infants, although the state to which he supposed them to be reduced after death was a 'state of non-existence,' which he describes as 'being the least demerit of imputed sin, or an everlasting forfeiture of life, and a sort of *endless punishment without pain.*' He is an authority, because his attempt shows the tendency of his system. Throughout his remarks upon the subject, he is evidently opposing the arguments of Calvinists who held harsher doctrines, or, again to use his own words, who held to such 'harder and more offensive consequences as *have been often* drawn or forced' from Calvinistic principles. He is an authority, because he believed and taught that such children of wicked parents as die in infancy, will be punished for their share in Adam's sin, and punished to the extent of their deserts; and this is all that was ever believed or taught by the most rigid asserter of infant damnation, even when these little ones are called 'vessels of wrath and firebrands of hell.' † Both go to the extent of their principles, and the principles of both are Calvinistic at the bottom.

Now if Edwards either believed that all infants would be saved, or doubted whether any would be damned, he could not have had a fairer opportunity to say so, than when thus writing against the less severe hypothesis of Watts. Nay, the touching appeals of that writer, were so many, and, one would think, irresistible calls upon him to represent the future condition of infants as favorably as his principles would any way allow. For, without some expression either of hope or of doubt, he must have known that it would inevitably be inferred that he had

* Ruin and Recovery. Quest. xvi. † Arthur Hildersham.

neither hope nor doubt to express. But not only has he given us no intimation of the one or the other, but on the contrary has dropped expressions which no man could have used, unless he believed in the very 'extremes' from which the writer he was opposing was endeavouring to escape by every means that his ingenuity, prompted by the deepest and tenderest interest in the subject upon which it was employed, could suggest. Nay, there is even an appearance of sarcasm in the mode in which he opens his attack upon Watts's gentler theory. For Watts had said that he had 'endeavoured to *relieve* and soften all the harsher and more obnoxious parts of his doctrine,' and Edwards in reply tells him, that he '*relieves nothing* but one's imagination,' 'and does not *relieve* one's reason at all;' that to conceive of the temporal 'torments of poor little infants as ending in death and annihilation, may sit easier on the *imagination*, than to conceive of their *suffering eternal misery* for it, but it does not at all *relieve* one's reason;' and all this he says, without so much as a hint that the latter conception is not as truly descriptive of *his* views of their actual future condition, as he knew the former was of those entertained by Watts. Watts thought it unwarrantable, unjust, and cruel, to punish infants, for mere imputed guilt, as severely as if their sin was of their own committing, though he believed they deserved to be punished, and that all the punishment they deserved would be actually inflicted. Edwards defends his system on the ground of its going to the very extreme against which Watts was so earnestly contending, and that too, both as regards the imputation and the punishment. 'There is no rule of reason,' he says, 'that can be supposed to lie against imputing a sin in the whole of it,—but what will also lie against its being so imputed and *punished* in part.' And again;—'There is no reason to be brought, why one man's sin cannot be justly reckoned to another's account, who was not then in being, in the *whole* of it; but what will as properly lie against its being reckoned to him in any part, so as that he should be *subject* to any condemnation or *punishment* on that account.'—'All the difference there can be,' he contends, 'is this; that to bring a *great punishment* on infants for Adam's sin, is a great act of injustice, and to bring a comparatively *small punishment*, is a smaller act of injustice, but not, that this is not as truly and demonstrably an act of injustice, as the other.' Not a saving clause for 'poor little infants,' as he contemptuously calls them, does he give us, from the beginning of the discussion to the end, and his not giving one, in such circumstances, is proof that he could not.

So too with respect to Edwards's opposition to 'the other di-

vine,' whom we suppose to be Ridgley. The mode in which he conducts it, and the fact that it is an opposition to the principles of a kind of mitigated infant damnation, on the ground that they do not go far enough, prove that he believed infants are damned according to the common acceptation of the term, by which is meant that they are punished in hell fire forever. Ridgley introduces his theory by remarking, that the punishment due to original sin, *as such*, is not distinguished from the greater degree of punishment which is due to its increasing guilt, 'by *many who treat* on this subject; which gives occasion to some, who deny original sin, to represent it in the most terrible view, as though there was no difference between the wrath of God, that infants are exposed to, and that which is inflicted on the most obdurate sinner.' * He then, in order to 'remove prejudices against this doctrine' of original sin, gives those views of the actual future punishment of infants, of which Dr Beecher presented us with so excellent a summary, while pretending to give the doctrine of Augustin. But in the mind of Edwards, he neither produced conviction, nor excited compassion. For,—

'The other divine,' says Edwards, 'thinks there is truly an imputation of Adam's sin, so that INFANTS cannot be looked upon as innocent creatures; yet seems to think it not agreeable to the perfections of God, to *make the state of infants in another world*, worse than nonexistence. But this to me,' he adds, and they are the words we quoted in our review, and which stand in the last extract from Dr Beecher, 'this to me appears plainly a giving up that grand point of the imputation of Adam's sin, both in whole and in part. For it supposes it to be not right, for God to bring any *evil* on a child of Adam, which is innocent as to personal sin, without *paying for it*, or balancing it with good; so that still the state of the child shall be as good, as could be demanded in justice, in case of mere innocence. Which plainly supposes that the child is not exposed to any proper *punishment* at all, or is not at all in debt to divine justice, on the account of Adam's sin. For if the child were truly in debt, then surely justice might take something from him without paying for it, or without giving that which makes its state as good, as mere innocence could in justice require. If he owes the suffering of some *punishment*, then there is no need that justice should requite the infant for suffering that punishment; or make up for it, by conferring some *good*, that shall countervail it, and in effect remove and disannul it; so that, on the whole, good and evil shall be at an even balance, yea, so that the scale of good shall preponderate. If it is unjust in a judge to order any quantity of money to be taken from another without paying him again, and fully making it up to him, it must be because he had justly forfeited none at all.' †

This is all that Edwards says with particular reference to the theory of Ridgley. The main point of his attention, indeed, is the justice or injustice of making the state of infants worse than a state of nonexistence. But he maintains that it *is* just to make it worse than nonexistence, and that in opposition to a

* Body of Divinity, p. 345. † Works, vol. vi. p. 462.

writer who believed that their state would be a state of actual punishment. Take this circumstance in connexion with the facts, that Ridgley wrote expressly to guard against the very extreme of doctrine, which, as we contend, Edwards adopts, and that Edwards gives not even a hint that infants, consistently with his own principles, will not after all actually suffer the 'perfect and eternal misery' they deserve, and the conclusion is inevitable that he consigned them to the torments of hell; and, that they will be the '*full* torments of hell,' is put beyond a doubt by the following extract, in which he carries out his system with so thorough and revolting a consistency. The passage immediately follows the one last quoted, and is the summing up of his doctrine of imputation as opposed to that of Watts and Ridgley.

'It seems to me pretty manifest that none can, in good consistence with themselves, own a real imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his posterity, without owning that they are justly viewed and TREATED as sinners, truly guilty and children of wrath on that account; nor unless they allow a just imputation of the whole of the evil of that transgression; at least all that pertains to the essence of that act, as a full and complete violation of the covenant which God had established; *even as much as if each one of mankind had the like covenant established with him singly, and had by the like direct and full act of rebellion, violated it for himself.*' *

The doctrine of Edwards, then, is, that INFANTS are just as guilty as Adam himself was; that they consequently deserve the full punishment threatened him for his disobedience; that this punishment is death—death temporal and eternal, perfect, helpless, never ending misery; that upon that portion of them which God, in the exercise of his absolute but inscrutable sovereignty, will pass by and leave in their lost estate by nature, this terrible punishment will be inflicted; that 'the sight of' their

* Works, vol. vi. pp. 462—8. We are not alone in supposing Edwards's language and reasoning here show that he believed in infant damnation. Indeed, who, but a writer driven to extremity, could think of disputing it? The following extract is from a work on the 'Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy,' by Bishop White, of Pennsylvania. The writer notices President Edwards's 'consistency in his pursuing of his principles into all their consequences. From these,' he adds, 'a very great proportion of the advocates of the system will always turn aside with horror; however consenting to the principles from which they are fairly drawn. An instance of this his consistency, shall be given from the section of his book the last under discussion. He finds fault with the writings of two dissenting divines, whose names are not mentioned; and who, although they acknowledged the imputation of Adam's sin, could not reconcile themselves to the hard case of the damnation of infants. To get rid of this, they supposed, that the first sin was not imputed to infants in the same degree, as to Adam himself. One of the divines was in hopes of providing, in this way, a retreat for the little wretches, in annihilation. The other thought himself entitled to affirm, that their condition would not be worse than nonexistence. All this is much to the dissatisfaction of President Edwards; who, arguing more logically from the data held in common, rejects such softening expedients, invented for the easing of the feelings of humanity.'—vol. i. pp. 395, 6.

'hell torments will exalt the happiness of the saints forever,' who will thus be enabled to partake of it with 'a more lively relish,' and God's 'vindictive justice, appear strict, exact, awful, terrible, and therefore GLORIOUS!' *

So much for Edwards 'as quoted by the reviewer.' We will now give two other passages from the same writer, which, whatever may be thought of those already cited, will, we trust, satisfy Dr Beecher himself that he was a believer in infant damnation. We produce them, however, not because we think them necessary, but because Dr Beecher 'especially' calls for the proof of Edwards's being an authority on this question, and because he is unquestionably one of the most important authorities of modern times. The first passage occurs in the course of his illustrations of another 'monstrous doctrine' of Calvinism; viz. that the calamities and sufferings of this life, to which infants, as well as adults, are not only exposed, but which they actually suffer, are, properly speaking, *punishments*. It is as follows;—

'We may well argue from these things, that INFANTS are not looked upon by God as sinless, but that they are by nature children of wrath, seeing this terrible evil comes so heavily on mankind in infancy. But besides these things, which are observable concerning the mortality of infants in general, there are some particular cases of the death of infants, which the scripture sets before us, that are attended with circumstances, in a peculiar manner giving evidences of the sinfulness of such, and their just exposedness to divine wrath. As particularly,

'The destroying of the INFANTS in Sodom, and the neighboring cities; which cities, destroyed in so extraordinary, miraculous, and awful a manner, are set forth as a signal example, of God's dreadful vengeance for sin, to the world in all generations; agreeable to that of the apostle, Jude, verse 7.'†

The text here referred to is in these words;—'Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, SUFFERING THE VENGEANCE OF ETERNAL FIRE.' By the '*vengeance of eternal fire*,' there can be little doubt that Edwards meant what Dr Beecher calls 'the gloom and torments of a "Calvinistic hell."' To cut off all hope whatever as to the future condition of these 'little vipers,'‡ he states and meets the objection, that in regard to their misery in this life, God might make it up to them in another world.

'To say here, that God could make it up to those infants in another world, must be an insufficient reply. For so he could as easily have made it up to Lot, or to ten or fifty righteous, if they had been destroyed

* See Edwards's celebrated Sermon on the Eternity of Hell Torments, in portraying which his imagination seems to run riot.

† Works, vol. vi. pp. 252–3. ‡ Works, vol. vi. p. 475.

in the same fire: Nevertheless it is plainly signified, *that this would not have been agreeable to the wise and holy proceedings of the judge of all the earth.*' *

The other passage to which we refer, is as follows;—

'Merely persons' being born in covenant, is no more evidence of their having moral sincerity, than saving grace. Yea, there is more reason to suppose the latter, than the former without it, in the infant children of believing parents. For the scripture gives us ground to think, that SOME INFANTS have the habit of saving grace, and that they have a new nature given them; but no reason at all to think, that ever God works any mere moral change in them, or infuses any habits of moral virtue without saving grace: And we know, they cannot come by moral habits in infancy, any other way than by immediate infusion: They cannot obtain them by human instruction, nor contract them by use and custom. And especially there is *no reason to think*, that the children of such as are visible saints, according to Mr Williams's scheme, *have any goodness infused into them by God, of any kind.* For in his scheme, all that are morally sincere may lawfully receive the privileges of visible saints. But we have *no scripture grounds to suppose, that God will bless the children* of such parents as have nothing more than moral sincerity, *with either common or* SAVING *grace.* There are no promises of the covenant of grace made to such parents, either concerning themselves or their children.' †

'Now then for the syllogism,' to borrow from Dr Beecher at once a favorite expression, and a favorite mode of presenting an argument. 1. Without God's 'saving grace' no one can be saved—all will certainly be damned. 2. Edwards here says that the infants of mere 'morally sincere men,' or 'half Christians,' as he calls them below, cannot have God's saving grace. 3. Therefore Edwards believed that no such infants can be saved—that they will all be inevitably damned. There is no escaping the force of this reasoning, except by denying the first proposition, which asserts the necessity of saving grace. But this would be to deny a fundamental principle of Calvinism, which, with all the mutations of Orthodoxy, we have never yet seen denied by any one who claims to be called by the Calvinistic name.‡

(To be continued.)

* Works, pp. 253–4. † Ibid. vol. i. pp. 497–8.

‡ Since our last sheet was struck off, we observe that we have spoken as if the extract on p. 331, contained absolutely 'all Dr Beecher has said in relation to Edwards, as he was cited in our review.' We had forgotten the following sentence in his first Letter, which however adds nothing to the extract we have given, and is virtually contained in it.—'Edwards, also, as quoted, reprobates a sentiment which would deny that infants are 'not *exposed* to any proper punishment at all on account of Adam's sin.' p. 47.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

35. A Discourse Delivered at the Installation of the Rev. Mellish Irving Motte, as Pastor of the South Congregational Society, in Boston, May 21, 1828. By William Ellery Channing. Second Edition. Boston, Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 22.

THIS is a valuable sermon, though we do not consider it one of Dr Channing's most successful efforts. The prominent idea is an important one, though not of a novel character—that Christianity is designed to 'exert an influence on the human mind.' 'In this its glory chiefly consists.' There is and can be 'no greater work on earth, than to purify the soul from evil, and to kindle in it new light, life, energy, and love.' This end Christianity labors to accomplish. This might be shown by a general survey of its precepts and doctrines, but it is sufficient to take one feature, 'the knowledge it gives of the character of God.' This topic is pursued at some length, and some popular misapprehensions concerning the nature of religion pointed out. After showing the 'great purpose of the christian doctrine respecting God, or in what its importance and glory consists,' and observing that every other doctrine of our religion has the same end, 'a fruitful subject,' Dr Channing remarks, 'on which he cannot enter,' he proceeds;

'It has been my object in this discourse to lay open a great truth, a central, all comprehending truth of Christianity. Whoever intelligently and cordially embraces it, obtains a standard by which to try all other doctrines, and to measure the importance of all other truths. Is it so embraced? I fear not. I apprehend that it is dimly discerned by many who acknowledge it, whilst on many more it has hardly dawned. I see other views prevailing, and prevailing in a greater or less degree among all bodies of Christians, and they seem to me among the worst errors of our times. Some of these I would now briefly notice.' p. 15.

The first is that of those, who, 'instead of placing the glory of Christianity in the pure and powerful action, which it gives to the human mind, seem to think, that it is rather designed to substitute the activity of another for our own.'—'Now the great purpose of Christianity is, not to procure or offer to the mind a friend on whom it may passively lean, but to make the mind itself wise, strong, and efficient. Its end is, not that wisdom and strength, as subsisting in another, should do everything for us, but that these attributes should grow perpetually in our own souls.' Again, there is a propensity in multitudes, 'to make a wide separation between religion, or christian virtue, and its rewards. That the chief reward lies in the very spirit of religion, they do not dream. They think of being Christians for the sake of something beyond the christian character, and something more precious.' In the third place,

'Men's ignorance of the great truth stated in this discourse, is seen in the low ideas attached by multitudes to the word *salvation*. Ask multitudes, what is the chief evil from which Christ came to save them, and they will tell you, "From hell, from penal fires, from future punishment." Accordingly they think, that salvation is something which another may achieve for them, very much as a neighbour may quench a conflagration that menaces their dwellings and lives. That word *hell*, which is used so seldom in the sacred pages, which, as critics will tell you, does not occur once in the writings of Paul, and Peter, and John, which we meet only in four or five discourses of Jesus, and which all persons acquainted with Jewish geography, know to be a metaphor, a figure of speech, and not a literal expression, this word, by a perverse and exaggerated use, has done unspeakable injury to Christianity.' p. 16.

On this passage the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims,' with its characteristic *fairness*, remarks,—'Now the truth is, this unfortunate English word, *hell*, occurs more than fifty times in our English translation of the bible; it is used both by Peter and John; and is inserted more than a dozen times in the record which is left us of the discourses of Jesus.'* Admit this, admit that the '*English* word' occurs in our '*English* translation so many times.'—What is all this to the purpose? It does not in the least affect the correctness of Dr C.'s remark, in the sense in which, as the writer in the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims' must have known, he meant to be understood. He may have expressed himself a little incautiously; we think he has; he might have said, the corresponding word in the original, or the word properly translated *hell*, occurs but seldom. Such was obviously his meaning; and it is something worse than cavilling to put any other construction on his language. The word in the original, γεεννα, answering to our English word *hell*, *does 'not occur*

* Number for July, p. 391.

once in the writings of *Paul* and *Peter*, and *John*,' and is met with '*only in four or five discourses of Jesus*,' though in one or two of those discourses it is repeated. In all, it occurs in the New Testament, twelve times—seven in Matthew, three in Mark, once in Luke, and once in James.* Of the seven instances of its use by Matthew three occur in the same discourse and same chapter, the fifth; again it occurs twice in the discourse recorded in the twenty-third chapter. Of the three instances in which it is used by Mark, all occur in the ninth chapter, and in one discourse of our Saviour, the same that is recorded by Matthew in the fifth chapter. The sum is this; according to Matthew our Saviour appears to have used the term on four occasions, or in four discourses. Mark mentions only one occasion, on which he used it, the same with one of those recorded by Matthew, and Luke mentions only one. It appears then that Jesus used it only on five occasions, at most, and in all the Epistles it occurs but once, and then in this connexion;—James observes of the tongue, that it 'setteth on fire the course of nature; and is set on fire of *hell*.' iii. 6.

There is another word, ἅδης, which king James's translators have sometimes rendered *hell*, but very improperly, as no one, who has the slightest tincture of biblical learning, will venture to deny. On the subject of these two words we cannot offer anything more to the purpose than the following observations of Dr Campbell, an eminent *Trinitarian* critic.

'The word γεεννα does not occur in the Septuagint. It is not a Greek word, and consequently not to be found in the Grecian classics. It is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words גיא הנם *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the book of Joshua. It was there that the cruel sacrifices of children were made by fire to Moloch, the Ammonitish idol. The place was also called *Tophet*, and that, as is supposed, from the noise of drums, (Toph signifying a drum), a noise raised on purpose to drown the cries of the helpless infants.'

'As to the word ἅδης, which occurs in eleven places in the New Testament, and is rendered hell in all, except one, where it is translated *grave*, it is quite common in classical authors, and frequently used by the Seventy, in the translation of the Old Testament. In my judgment, *it ought never in the scripture to be rendered hell, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians.* In the Old Testament the corresponding word is שאול *sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating that word, the Seventy have almost invariably used ἅδης.'—'But it is very plain, that neither in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament nor in the New, does the word ἅδης convey the meaning which the present English word *hell*, in the christian usage, always conveys to our minds.'—'Who would render the words of the venerable patriarch Jacob, when he was deceived by his sons into the opinion that his favorite child Joseph had been devoured by a wild beast, *I will go down to hell to my son mourning?* or the words, which he used, when they expostulated with him about sending his youngest son Benjamin into Egypt along with them; *Ye will bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to hell?* Yet in both of these places, the word in the original is *sheol*, and in the version of the Seventy, *hades*,'*—very inconsistently rendered *hell* in our common version, in several passages both of the Old and New Testament. It means the grave, or the place of the departed, without reference to their condition as happy or miserable. In the passages above quoted by Dr Campbell, it might have been translated *hell* with just as much propriety, as in several others in which it is so translated.†

There is another word, which occurs once, 2 Peter, ii. 4. and only once, in the New Testament, ταρταρωσας, rendered very improperly, 'cast down to hell.' It should have been translated, either 'thrust down to Tartarus,' or

* Matt. v. 22, 29, 30. x. 28. xviii. 9. xxiii. 15, 33. Mark, ix. 43, 45, 47. Luke, xii. 5. James, iii. 6.

* Dissert. vi. Part ii.

† The eleven places in which it occurs in the New Testament are, Matt. xi. 23. xvi. 18. Luke, x. 15. xvi. 23. Acts, ii. 27, 31. I Cor. xv. 55, translated *grave*, and Rev. i. 18. vi. 8. xx. 13, 14. It occurs in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament between sixty and seventy times.

simply 'cast down,' which, according to Grotius, is all it here means. That the place, meant to be designated by it, was not γεεννα, hell, is evident from the words which immediately follow, which represent the fallen angels as reserved in it, as in a sort of prison house, till the final judgment. Now hell, γεεννα, or the state of suffering indicated by that figurative term, comes after judgment. So Dr Campbell. Peter then does not say, that the apostate angels are cast into hell, or the place of final punishment, if we may speak of *place* in this connexion, but only that they are confined, till they shall be brought to judgment, in a place of darkness, called Tartarus. By this, says Grotius, is meant the lower regions of the atmosphere near the earth, called obscure or shadowy, as may be gathered from Philo and Plutarch, in comparison with heaven, where is light superior to that of the sun and moon, pure, and unmingled with darkness. According to this opinion, the apostate spirits are supposed to have been thrust down from the upper heavens, the abode of purest light, into the nether atmosphere, far below the region of the stars, where they are confined, as in a prison, and beyond the limits of which they are not permitted to wander. Hence the expression, 'Prince of the power of the air.' Eph. ii. 2. Whatever weight be allowed to the criticism of Grotius, which is certainly ingenious, it is evident that the word in question is very inaccurately translated, 'cast down to hell.'

Dr Channing notices another instance of the error he is endeavouring to expose—'the common apprehensions formed of heaven, and of the methods by which it may be obtained. Not a few, I suspect, conceive of heaven as a foreign good. It is a distant country, to which we are to be conveyed by an outward agency. How slowly do men learn, that heaven is the perfection of the mind, and that Christ gives it now just as far as he raises the mind to celestial truth and virtue.' The following are part of his concluding remarks.

'Look not abroad for the blessings of Christ. His reign and chief blessings are within you. The human soul is his kingdom. There he gains his victories, there rears his temples, there lavishes his treasures. His noblest monument is a mind, redeemed from iniquity, brought back and devoted to God, forming itself after the perfection of the Saviour, great through its power to suffer for truth, lovely through its meek and gentle virtues. No other monument does Christ desire; for this will endure and increase in splendor, when earthly thrones shall have fallen, and even when the present order of the outward universe shall have accomplished its work, and shall have passed away.' pp. 21-2

---

36. Annotations on the New Testament. By J. P. Dabney. Boston. 1838.

It has long been a matter of surpriseto us, that a work precisely of this description has not been prepared and published by some gentleman of leisure, and competent learning. The complaint has grown quite common of late, that we want a family bible; but as this is an undertaking, which requires much time and labor, and besides must be very expensive, it was to be expected that it would be preceded by a publication like the present. The great object of a family bible, too, certainly *one* of the greatest, the explanation of scripture, may be effectually answered in a cheap and unpretending volume, like the one before us; which for this very reason may be put into the hands of readers generally, while the circulation of a larger and more expensive work must, as a natural consequence, be quite limited. We also have serious doubts about the propriety of spreading before the reader, on the same page, text, comment, and practical observations; as it may insensibly lead him, and we believe it often does in fact lead the unthinking, to attach to them all the same, or nearly the same authority. It would be amusing, if it were not for some of its moral influences, and its effect on the progress of truth, to see with what solemn assent many a pious and well meaning Christian reads the hasty and ill digested commentary of Scott, and takes it all for gospel, though it is perfectly understood, that no well informed critic of any denomination would give to that writer's opinions on such subjects the weight of a feather. We may mention another objection to family bibles; their assuming, as they seem to do, that, looking merely to its moral uses, we are to read the bible through in course, as if some parts, in a practical view, were not much more valuable than others, and should not be read oftener; or as if any good could come from ever reading before children and

young persons such a book as Solomon's Song; or from trying to spell out whole chapters of hard names in Numbers.

We will not say, all things considered, that a family bible is not desirable; but we shall probably have to wait several years before one is prepared, and in the mean time must avail ourselves of some such substitute as is offered in the compilation before us. One number, as a specimen of the work, has been some time before the public, and another much larger will soon follow, continuing the annotations through the rest of Matthew and Mark; most of which we have had an opportunity to examine. Considering this work as intended for common readers, and especially for teachers in Sunday Schools, several things may be noticed, which entitle it, as we conceive, to commendation, and ought to bring it into general use.

Probably no work of the kind now extant, comes so near as this will, as a whole, to exhibiting the sense of scripture held by the majority of Unitarians in this country. The notes are brief, and as few, as the objects of the work will possibly allow; in consequence of which, the whole will be comprised in a moderately sized duodecimo volume. The compiler shows none of the perverse ingenuity of those commentators who seem, next to the honor of removing an old difficulty, to reckon that of discovering a new one. He also avoids giving a multitude of interpretations to the same passage, of all which, excepting one or two, perhaps, the best that can be said is, that they are ingenious and plausible. In this way it would have been easy for him to make a parade of what is called learning; but its effect on common readers would have been to distract their minds, and introduce uncertainty; so that, where the book would have met and resolved one doubt, it would probably have suggested twenty. Besides, we believe that those commentators and compilers who are most officious in their endeavours to explain what is already sufficiently intelligible, commonly compensate themselves for this useless trouble, by skipping the really difficult passages. It should also be mentioned in praise of this work, that it is not controversial either in manner or spirit; for though the compiler gives what he conceives to be the best and truest comments on difficult and disputed passages, he does not dwell on them, nor attach an undue importance to them, nor fall to abusing those who understand them differently. Finally, it will add to the value and authority of these Annotations, that the name of the author is given, we believe in every case, whom the compiler has quoted or followed; and perhaps we cannot better recommend the work than by saying, that of these names, none occur so frequently as those of Grotius, Le Clerc, Rosenmuller, Wakefield, and Priestley.

Some may object that these Annotations are not always so full and perspicuous that they will be readily comprehended by common readers, and perhaps they are are not; and this may be owing in a few instances to an obscure and involved style, which might have been avoided without any sacrifice of brevity. It should be considered, however, that to make every part of scripture perfectly plain and simple to the unlearned, it would have been necessary for the compiler to insert, not short notes merely, but whole dissertations, and change essentially the character of the work. Many ministers, who are in the habit of lecturing on the scriptures, will probably recommend this work to their people, as a sort of text-book, and will be able to supply the deficiency here complained of, as occasion offers; and we can conceive of no other way in which it can be supplied, in all cases, without losing and sacrificing more than would be gained. It is easy to cavil at particular omissions or failures; after all, however, we suspect it will be difficult to refer to any work, which will give, even to common readers, and in the same compass, so much useful and agreeable information.

We hope Mr Dabney will go on and complete the volume without any unnecessary delays; and we are glad to learn that this is his object, and that he proposes to have the whole off his hands by the first of March. We hope, also, that he will give a preface to the Annotations, containing brief historical notices of the several books of the New Testament, and something which may serve as a key, particularly to the Epistles. It would not swell the volume much, it would greatly enhance its value, and the labor it would require would be inconsiderable.

37. A Discourse on the reciprocal Duties of a Minister and his People; delivered at the Opening of the Christian Chapel in Salem, Mass. May 1, 1828. By Charles Morgridge, Minister of the First Christian Society in New Bedford. Boston: Wait, Greene, & Co. 1828. 12mo. pp. 24.

THIS is a well written, and somewhat original performance. In old times, the pastoral care used to be almost the only subject chosen by preachers at dedications and ordinations; of course it became a little the worse for so constant wear. But lately, such an abundant variety of topics has been discussed on those occasions, that the pastoral care comes before us with an aspect approaching to novelty. In any times, however, this sermon must have been listened to with interest, and been deemed creditable to the understanding, piety, taste, and heart of the writer. We regard it with additional pleasure, as the work of a gentleman who stands high among the ministers of that denomination of Christians called *Christian*, which we have been for some time in the habit of considering as a remarkable and effectual instrument in diffusing widely abroad through our population, correct, generous, and scriptural views of christian theology; a denomination in which are united simplicity with good sense, and a deep and zealous piety with rational opinions.

There are some instances in this sermon of a quaintness, which reminds us of the old English writers. Advising a minister of the gospel to let mystery alone, and preach plainly and directly from the bible, Mr Morgridge says, 'He will thereby avoid the criminality of darkening counsel by words without knowledge. He will also avail himself of the singular advantage of preaching to all who believe the scriptures, without giving needless offence to any; while every devout hearer, being free from disquieting apprehensions *of having his ear cut off by the sword of sectarianism*, cannot fail to receive instruction, and comfort, and blessing under such a ministry.'

A curious legend is introduced towards the end of the discourse, to illustrate the position, that in doing his people service the minister increases the difficulty of his own salvation. From what author or book it is taken, we confess that we do not know; but it is as follows;—

'Coivin, now with God and his angels, had a vision to this purpose, on the day of his consecration to the ministry. Awful thoughts filled his soul. A heavenly light shone in his cell. He turned his eye to the heavens, and, lo! they were illuminated; he looked to the earth, and, lo! it was on fire. The judgment throne was set, and the inhabitants of heaven and earth assembled. Michael stood forth before the judge, and held in his hand that mighty balance in which souls and their actions are weighed. When ordinary mortals were put into the scales, the standard by which they were tried was less and lighter; nor did they seem to be too scrupulously weighed, if the beam stood only near a poise. Nay, the breath of mercy made it sometimes incline in their favor, when all the pleas that made for them could not decidedly cast it. But when ministers came to be weighed, the standard was ten times augmented, for those of whom least was required; and, in general, that by which they were tried was the weight of the angel Ithiel, prince of the seventh or lowest order of the hierarchy of heaven. For God had ordained, that in the progressive scale there should be no blank, and that the highest order of men should reach the lowest order of superior beings. Coivin reflected on the dread office to which he was set apart; he perceived the awful sanctity and care which it required. His heart swelled; the tears burst from his eyes; he wiped them with his hand and the vision vanished. The impression, however, remained, and Coivin lived on earth, innocent, and active, as an angel of heaven.'—p. 21.

To this vision is immediately subjoined by the preacher, with great simplicity, '*Thus you see*, brethren, that the salvation of your minister is, by the nature of his office, rendered far more difficult than if he sustained a private relation.'

---

38. An Address, delivered at Springfield, before the Hampden Colonization Society, July 4th, 1828. By William B. O. Peabody.—Springfield, S. Bowles. 1828. 8vo. pp. 16.

WE fear that the national character is more likely to be debased than elevated, by the manner in which the anniversary of our Independence is commonly celebrated. We do not now refer to the dissipation and excess which often attend it, but to the addresses and orations, written for the most part by young men without maturity of mind, or discretion, and wholly for popular effect. It is something that the public taste should be depraved by these puerile and inflated compositions; but this is an evil which dwindles into insignificance compared with their moral and political influences. The day had better not be remembered at all than be remembered merely to exasperate and inflame party spirit; or to keep alive antipathies against the mother country, which every good man must wish to

see buried; or to feed a national vanity, at the same time one of the most enfeebling and one of the most contemptible of passions.

We are delighted when we meet with a striking exception to these remarks, as in this Address of Mr Peabody, written in the peculiar and beautiful style for which the author is justly distinguished, and on a subject, and in a spirit, so appropriate to the occasion. His object is to explain the reason of the imperfect influence of Christianity on the public relations of men, considered with a particular reference to slavery and war.

'I may as well say in the beginning, that I am speaking simply of the relation of slavery and the practice of war. I am not complaining of the owners of slaves; they cannot get rid of them; it would be as humane to throw them from the decks in the middle passage as to set them free in our country. Neither do I condemn defensive war; it rests upon the rights of selfdefence, which individuals possess, and may delegate to governments if they will. I have no taste for sweeping condemnation. I can sympathize with the owners of slaves, and admire the patriotic defenders of their country, while I detest war and slavery with all my heart.' p. 3-4

Five reasons are assigned for the imperfect influence of Christianity in correcting these evils, on each of which the writer insists at some length, and often eloquently. 1. Men regard the letter more than the spirit of religion. 2. It requires great christian principle to make men abandon vices, though it requires very little to make men disapprove them. 3. We consider the point as gained already. 4. Men have applied a different morality to public and private affairs. 5. No community, no nation can properly be said to be christian, in the highest and best sense of that word.

This is the outline, and our limits will permit us to give but a single specimen of the manner in which the author fills it up.

'We think that the public feeling is sufficiently alive to the criminality of slavery and war, and that no exertions are necessary to add to the prevailing conviction of their guilt. I must say that we take praise to ourselves too soon. Christianity can do but little to reform the world, if men are so easily satisfied with their success. I look in vain for the proofs of this general condemnation of these gigantic sins. I see on the contrary a lofty and enthusiastic interest everywhere excited by deeds of battle and blood. I see the guilty paths of great destroyers, traced upon the map with breathless emotion; I see the finest productions of earthly inspiration growing out of this corruption, like wild flowers from the heaps where the bodies of the slain decay, and the warmest reverence the world can give, lavished on those, who trample most widely and carelessly on the rights and feelings of men. We may say that we admire not the destruction nor the guilt; not the field shaken with artillery and slippery with blood, but the great intellectual energy displayed in guiding the vast masses of human power; this will not do; for great energy should be detested for its alliance with crime, rather than crime be forgiven because united with energy. The public religious feeling must be pronounced unsound, so long as men can admire these splendid sins; and it is absolutely impossible for one who worships these destroyers, to have any real reverence for the gentle greatness of the Son of God.' p. 7-8.

---

39. Religious Discourses. By a Layman. Philadelphia, Carey, Lea & Carey. 1828. 18mo. pp. 79.

It is well known that this 'Layman' is Sir Walter Scott. The English publisher, who is the gentleman for whom the discourses were written, calls them 'remarkable productions of their illustrious author's mind.' Remarkable they certainly are, in several respects. They are remarkable for their singular, and if we have been rightly informed, not exceedingly creditable history; and they are remarkable for not showing a single spark of their author's extraordinary genius, which glows and burns so brightly on every page of his other writings, that we may well call that work of his remarkble which reflects not a solitary glimmer. There are a hundred better sermons, of a page, two pages, or half a page in length, in Sir Walter's glorious novels, each of which sermons contains more eloquence and better divinity than the seventynine pages of these discourses put together.

There are two ways in which we would account for this phenomenon. One is, that the author, as soon as he found himself writing a sermon, caught an infectious dullness from his employment, which even his spirit could not overcome, and a strain of high Orthodoxy, which had always been associated in his mind with pulpit performances; and the other is, that he endeavoured, from motives of policy, and a regard for his young friend, to be as dull as he could, in which attempt he has wonderfully succeeded. Private anecdote informs us, how truly we know not, though the preface remarkably corroborates the story, that Sir Walter was, some time ago, applied to by a 'young friend' to

compose two sermons, the one doctrinal, the other practical, which might be presented by that friend, *as his own*, to some body of men before whom he was to be examined as a theological candidate. Sir Walter consented, and in one afternoon, or some such period, produced the discourses which are now given to the public; thus goodnaturedly enough condescending to become *grinder*, we believe they call it thus, to his 'young friend.' It is added, that when some one inquired of the baronet whether he was not afraid of sending his friend before the examiners with sermons which he had struck off in so short a time, he answered, that 'he must be a poor stick if he could not satisfy the baillies o' Edinbro!' If this story is true, let the discourses pass as remarkable productions of *grinding*, and so far forth, of their illustrious author's mind. We should like to know moreover, now the discourses are published, how the 'young friend' gets along with 'the baillies o' Edinboro'. We do not understand these things in the new world.

INTELLIGENCE.

Correspondence of the American Unitarian Association, on the State of Unitarian Christianity.—[In May last the Secretary of the Amer. Unit. Assoc. addressed a series of questions to Unitarian clergymen and other gentlemen of high standing in different sections of the country, intended to elicit information on the state and prospects of Unitarianism. The Orthodox periodicals had represented the late extraordinary efforts to get up Orthodox revivals, &c. as having resulted, or as fast resulting in the extinction of the 'Arian and Socinian heresies' so called, especially in Massachusetts where the most strenuous exertions have been made to that effect. From the mass of letters received in reply, all of which are of the most encouraging character, we have been permitteed to publish as many as our limits will allow, and we now present our readers with a number from various parts of Massachusetts, which are given without selection, and which may hereafter be followed by others from this and other States of the Union.]

FRANKLIN COUNTY.

'On the question relating to the progress of Unitarian Christianity, I can hardly hope to be considered an impartial judge. I will, however, confine mytelf chiefly to facts, and will endeavour to state them as correctly as I can. My remarks will be confined mostly to this county. In my own society, nothing to my knowledge, has been attempted to alienate the mind from liberal views of the gospel; nor do I apprehend, that such an attempt would meet with any success. Though this society is small, containing probably not more than a fifth or sixth of the inhabitants of the town, yet those who are well acquainted with the state of things here, have repeatedly told me, that they believe one half at least of the people are charitably liberal in their opinions and feelings. Many of this class belong to the Episcopal Society, which they had joined before ours was formed; and others, from local, or other prejudices, are induced to remain where they are. The prospects of our society have never been better, I think, than at present. In some towns in this vicinity, there is little or no advance in the truth; the people remain very much under the influence of the Calvinistic clergy, and have scarcely any opportunity to become enlightened. But in many other towns the progress of Unitarianism is far more rapid, than could have been expected. Within a few years three Orthodox societies have been formed in this county, in towns where there were none before; viz. in N——, S——, N———, and B———, ston. They are all feeble; and that in the last named town does not contain more than eight or ten families. The two former have ministers supported in part by the Domestic Missionary Society. So far as I know, this is all that can be said of the progress of Orthodoxy in this county. On the other hand, in many towns, where it formerly held exclusive sway, Unitarian societies, embracing a respectable portion of the population, have been formed, within a few years. This is true of M——,

and L——— on the east side of the river, and G——, G——, C——, H———, S———, and C———, on the west. I omit D———, because the change there is of longer standing; but what took place there twenty years ago did not a little toward leading the people in this vicinity to think for themselves. I will state a few particulars respecting some of the towns which I have mentioned. In M———, two years ago, the town was chiefly in one society, having an Orthodox minister, Mr G——. He is now dismissed; and at least one half of those, who formerly belonged to his society, now constitute a Unitarian society. In S———, within a few weeks, a Unitarian society has been formed, containing from thirty to forty voters, and a good portion of the wealth, intelligence, and influence of the town. The state of things in C——— is not less favorable. In H—— the number of Unitarians is increasing every year. In each of these places, it is desirable, that a Unitarian minister should be settled. But such ministers are not to be found in sufficient numbers to satisfy these wants. In C———, where till lately, the Orthodox have held undivided possession, a majority of the people now belong to the Liberal society. Were I to go into Hampshire County, I could give you a favorable account of P——, G———, W——, B———, W———, &c. but for information of the state of things there I would refer you to Mr H———, of N———. In our region, I think, there is a general spirit of inquiry as to religious subjects, and a visible improvement of morals. The tone of feeling is becoming more liberal and elevated, and there is an increasing disposition to place religion in a good life, rather than in particular creeds, and occasional excitements. There are exceptions to this remark, and the most of them would probably be found in the most rigid of the Orthodox churches, where creeds and experiences are used as tests of character. If any means could be adopted to send a missionary into this county, a young man, who would devote his whole time to preaching and visiting, in the towns which I have mentioned, he would do great service to the cause of pure Christianity.'

BRISTOL COUNTY.

Your questions may, I think, be best answered by adverting, first, to the fact that, during the ministry of my predecessor, the great subjects of controversy, which were much agitated in many other parts of the country, were not brought distinctly before the minds of the people here, and of course did not excite a general interest. It was known that Mr P—— was not a Calvinist, but his parishioners generally did not suppose that he differed in other respects from ministers who are now called Orthodox. A few years, however, before his decease, he discontinued the use of Watts's doxologies; and his so doing occasioned for a time much unchristian excitement. I commenced preaching here in April 1821. In the mean time a hue and cry was raised by the Calvinists of this vicinity about the terrible Unitarian heresy, and great efforts were made to prevent the settlement of a Unitarian minister. They succeeded in exciting the fears and strengthening the prejudices of many who then heard of Unitarianism for the first time, or who were already deeply imbued with another doctrine, so that soon after my ordination, about sixteen seceded from my society. Such was the origin of the Orthodox society in this village. From that time the Orthodox in this vicinity have been unwearied in their efforts to stop the progress of Liberal Christianity. How far they have succeeded I will give you the best means I have of judging.—As to the course which I have pursued, my people can bear witness that it has been plain and unequivocal. I have not suffered them to be in any doubt as to what I have thought of the leading doctrines of Orthodoxy. It has been my constant object to establish my people in the belief and practice of pure Unitarian Christianity—the 'truth as it is in Jesus.' They can now, I thank God, bear the light and do rejoice in it. I can confidently say that there has been a great improvement in the moral and religious character of the people here within the last seven years. Formerly there was but one house for public worship in the village—now there are three; one of which was not long since built by the Baptists and the other by Mr M——'s society. Formerly not more than one half of the pews in the meetinghouse of the First Congregational Society were usually occupied. Now they are commonly filled with attentive hearers, and for the two last years applications have been

frequently made for pews and seats, which could not be obtained. Formerly the the sabbath was devoted to dissipation of various kinds, as I am credibly informed, by at least as large a number of people as usually attended public worship. Now the sabbath is about as well observed here as in any town in the State of as great a population. The large number of foreigners, who, in the course of the last three years, have been employed in the manufacturing establishments here, have not produced so bad an effect upon the morals of the place as might have been and indeed was expected. So much concerning things in general. Now I will say something more about my own society in particular.

'The next fall after my ordination the church at my request laid aside the old creed and covenant or confession of faith, which was used during Mr P——'s ministry in admitting members to communion, and adopted one simply requiring the candidate to receive the scriptures as a sufficient rule of faith and conduct. In 1824 I persuaded my people, who had always used Watts's Psalms and Hymns, to give them up for the New York Collection. I was much gratified that the change soon became universally satisfactory. I have already said that our meetinghouse is commonly filled—the pews and galleries occupied. My congregation has increased in number every year. It never was at any former period so numerous as it has been for the last twelve months, and, what is worthy of notice, this accession of numbers and strength is of a substantial kind—not made up of the floating population of the village and neighbourhood, but embracing principally men permanently and prosperously settled in business. You will undoubtedly be pleased to learn that my society have lately voted to build, in the course of the present season, a large and permanent meetinghouse of stone or brick, at the cost of not less than sixteen thousand dollars. Our present house was built only thirtysix years ago, and is about as large as any in this part of the country, but is not large enough to accommodate all who wish to connect themselves with our society. I am not sure, however, that such a project would have been started at this time had not Orthodox zeal attempted to revive &c. * * * * You wish to know how far the people of this vicinity are willing "to countenance attempts to restrain free inquiry and undermine religious liberty." Those who are at all aware that such attempts are making, contemplate them with strong feelings of indignation. In no part of the country are the people more attached to religious liberty; and though they are generally friendly to free inquiry, yet there is less of its spirit here than in some other parts of the State; that is, the people generally read less. But in this respect there is an evident improvement taking place. Pains have been taken to circulate Unitarian books and tracts, and the effect has been to excite the spirit of inquiry and to establish the minds of many in right general notions of the gospel. A "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge," embracing many of the most intelligent and active of my parishioners and a few gentlemen of the neighbouring town of R——, has been very useful. The books purchased by the funds of this society are read by all who are willing to read them, and when read are returned to me as librarian. I endeavour to keep them in use. The juvenile library also, which is connected with our Sunday school, does much good, by giving the children a taste for reading, and by promoting their orderly behaviour, especially on the sabbath. On the whole it is evident to my mind that the knowledge and virtue of this part of the country are increasing, and consequently that the people are becoming more and more unfit to be the abject slaves or the humble servants of spiritual tyrants.

'I fear I have already trespassed too far on your patience. But as the Orthodox have boasted much of their success in building up the Trinitarian society in this village, I should like to tell you *how* they effected it—how they pulled down Mr C——'s society in doing it, by drawing away a large part of his hearers—how those who remained with him, aided by a small fund, removed their meetinghouse about two miles from their former place of worship into the neighbourhood of a cotton factory to find a congregation, &c. &c.'

ESSEX COUNTY.

'As to the state of Unitarian Christianity in this quarter, it is highly encouraging to its friends. In my own parish it has never had more nor warmer advocates. It is now more than seven-

teen years since my connexion with this people. During the whole of this period we have known how good a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. Attempts have often been made by the members of the Theological Seminary in this town, and by the Orthodox clergy of neighbouring parishes, to disturb and scatter this parish; but thanks to the great Head of it, without effect. Nearly every year of my ministry has given evidence of its salutary influence in the growing numbers of my church, and in the improving character of the people at large. But in no single year has this evidence been so abundant as in the last. The better rational views of Christianity are understood by my people, the stronger is their hold on their affections and confidence, and the more cheerful they become to make an effort to defend and propagate them. Nor is this feeling and disposition confined to my own parish. The Exclusive System kept up by the Orthodox clergy in this neighbourhood, has roused the righteous indignation of their people and made them tremble. Within one year this system has led to the removal of two ministers in the town of H——. In the west parish the society are earnestly seeking a Unitarian preacher. And in the village an Orthodox man is settled with an understanding that his continuance depends on the liberality of his exchanges. In B——, B——, R——, and T——, numbers of the most influential people have withdrawn their support from Orthodoxy and are supporting Unitarian worship; and in all those places it is believed the Orthodox ministers stand on slippery ground. At L——, they have exchanged an Exclusive man, and the upper parish in B—— are on the verge of doing the same. In the south parish in this town, lately under the care of Dr E——, nine tenths of the inhabitants are firm friends of toleration. And what is more, a respectable number of them are decided Unitarians. These facts speak loud, and whatever may be the condition of Unitarian Christianity elsewhere, I am confident it has no cause for despondency here, but in the imperfections of its professors and friends. It is true the Orthodox are on the alert, and if confidence and boasting and revival making will give them success, they *may* carry all before them. The business of 'getting up revivals' seems to be their last resort in an expiring cause. Whenever I hear of an extraordinary attempt at one, I conclude the minister feels his hold on his parish giving way. 'The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.' Let Unitarians make an effort of half the magnitude of their opponents, and their cause is safe. God will bless his truth. It must triumph.'

ESSEX COUNTY, *(south eastern part.)*

'Unitarianism, considered as an appellation distinguishing all those Christians who dissent from Trinitarian and Calvinistic views, is spreading gradually in this place. The change which has taken place in the religious sentiments of many of the inhabitants of this town, within the last sixteen years, is great. When I was settled in the ministry, the whole of my parish were Trinitarian in their views, and a large portion of them Calvinistic; and although I explicitly declared to them, prior to my settlement, my own opinions, still they unanimously persisted in inviting me to take the pastoral care of them. For two or three years, peculiarities of religious opinions attracted but little attention; but when the public mind became excited, and directed to these subjects, then my own opinions were vehemently attacked by some of my own parish; gross misrepresentations of them were made, and the most unfair and unchristian means were resorted to to render my instructions and myself suspicious. This conduct awakened the attention of my people to the religious points in dispute; and the unfair and evidently unjust methods employed by the disaffected, led the honest part of the parish, and the serious of other societies, to examine their own opinions, to compare them with the sacred scriptures, to scrutinize closely those which I entertained, and the reasons advanced in support of them. The result was, that more than two thirds of my parish at once became rationally and decidedly Unitarian and Anticalvinistic in their opinions. The number of this description has gradually increased, so that at present, very few, if any, are found in my parish, which is a very large one, who are in reality Trinitarian, or Calvinistic. Some few indeed, aged persons, retain the language, the phrases &c. of Orthodoxy; but they in fact have nothing of it in their opinions, nor in their temper.

'In the society under the pastoral care of Mr D——, very many of the most respectable proprietors are decidedly Anticalvinistic, but remain there, as we think they ought to and as we wish, to aid in the support of stated religious instruction. You will remember, that the zealous Mr ——— is of that society, whose name is found in most of the Orthodox periodicals. His influence and efforts, however, do not, in my opinion, add any to his party. On the whole, it is fully my conviction, that what I consider liberal and just views of Christianity, are prevailing here.'

PLYMOUTH COUNTY.

'The cause of Unitarian Christianity, notwithstanding the boasting of the Orthodox, I am confident, is not losing, but gaining ground in this town and vicinity. I will mention a few facts and circumstances, which authorize me to express this opinion. My own church has been better filled, and the number much larger, during the last year and present, than for any period for five years previous. And the parish clerk informs me, that not an individual has 'signed off,' as they term it, for two years, to any other society, but several have joined us from the Orthodox, and others, it is known, intend doing it soon. It is the general opinion of the most intelligent gentlemen in the society, that it is improving in numbers and property. The spirit of free inquiry is among us. Without any solicitation, I may say, I have thirty subscribers in my society for the Liberal Preacher; and chiefly those who are not subscribers to the tracts of the Amer. Unita. Asso. New subscribers are added almost every week. So far as I have the means of judging, I am persuaded there never was more freedom of inquiry, and never more interest felt and expressed in the progress and success of Unitarianism, or Rational Christianity, than at this time; and my belief is, that any open attempt to stop its progress, would prove more injurious to the Orthodox societies than to the Liberal. The general opinion is, that the Calvinistic Baptist society and the other Orthodox society have lost ground within the last two years.

'I am not very intimately acquainted with the state of religion in the neighbouring towns. In W——, however, the minister who was Orthodox, is dismissed and gone, and, as a society, they are evidently Liberal. I preached there lately to a very respectable assembly, and a very attentive audience, although on the same day a meeting was held at a private house by the Orthodox. The society, three to one, I was told, are advocates for Liberal Christianity, and this town has always been under the yoke of the Orthodox. Five years ago the council that ordained the late minister, voted Mr G—— and his church out of the council, on the ground that he was not the pastor of any church. The present condition of this society is the result of this outrage.

'On the whole, I place no confidence in the reports of the Orthodox periodicals on the state of religion, or the progress and triumphs of Orthodoxy. They are not true; they are exaggerated, highly colored, and in many instances absolutely false. It is painful to read them, for they are not to be believed. We have only to regret that men, who would be thought to embrace and teach all that is true and good in Christianity, should pay so little regard to truth and goodness in maintaining their cause.'

BRISTOL COUNTY.

'The truth is, that the revival seasons of the last two years have been utterly defeated of their object so far as Unitarians are concerned. It was confidently expected that this blast would tear us to pieces. The storm has gone by, and we all stand firm.

'Nothing could be more true than all this with regard to *ourselves*. Our society has regularly increased, and the Orthodox have not gained from us a single member, of any description.

'Things are more promising in this neighbourhood. A strong demonstration has been made in favor of Liberal principles in W——, eighteen miles east of us. It appears that half of the town is Liberal, and the Calvinistic clergyman is dismissed. Whether they will be able to support a Unitarian minister, is doubtful. I am surprised to find that Liberal thinkers are springing up in other towns around us.'

WORCESTER COUNTY.

'In answer to your questions, I will endeavour to state my impression, and give you such facts as come within my knowledge. I think the people are inquiring, and are taking a more decided ground—and this is altogether

favorable to our cause. Our own parish has grown since the last year. Several respectable families have been added. Our meeting is far better filled than it was a year ago. We have commenced a new house, for it is impossible to procure seats for all who would worship with us. We have added nearly twenty to our church, and a spirit of inquiry and of religious earnestness prevails among our people. Although there has been an excitement among the Orthodox, we have lost none. In the aspect of things in our neighbourhood, we have everything to encourage us. In L—— an Auxiliary to the American Unitarian Assoc. has been formed. B—— has formed a new Unitarian parish. G——, R——, and O——, are discontented with the present state of things, and I may say generally, in the county, the people are for putting the question to their ministers, whether they mean to be Exclusive or not. I do not hesitate to say that it is my firm belief that the aspect of things is far more favorable than it was a year ago.'

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY.

'To your circular, asking for information, I have not much to say that I have not said before. Things remain much as in the fall—better in some places, worse in *none*. The aspect of affairs is certainly encouraging. I have not heard of anything to dishearten in the least—not a single instance of backsliding or conversion from Unitarianism to Orthodoxy, or anything of the kind—but much implying an opposite progress.'

Unitarian Ministers.—[There is no want which the Unitarian denomination at the present moment feels more sensibly than that of an increased number of Unitarian ministers. Any hints as to the best manner in which this want may be supplied, are therefore seasonable and valuable. It is for this reason and not because we are prepared to advocate in their full extent the measures it proposes, that we publish the following extract from a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Am. Unit. Assoc. by a highly respectable clergyman of Pennsylvania, who has had particularly favorable opportunities for judging to what extent the remark we begun with is true.]

'I have just read, with much interest, the account of the Theological School at Cambridge, in the Christian Examiner for March and April, 1827. I have heard from other sources of information that the demand for Unitarian ministers is greater than that School can at present supply. It is therefore highly desirable and necessary, that some new method should be adopted for sending a greater number of young men into the ministry, that we may be able to supply the increased and increasing demand for pastors and teachers. Will you pardon me, if I venture to suggest a plan, which I think might easily be carried into execution, and which would be productive of immense advantage to the Unitarian cause.

'I have understood that it is an indispensable prerequisite for admission into the Theological School, that young men should be pretty well advanced in the knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages, and in some branches of general science. This arrangement necessarily excludes a number of worthy and excellent young men, who, having arrived at mature age before they were convinced of the truth and value of our doctrines, and having only an English education, are at once deterred from devoting themselves to the ministry, from the long preparation that would be necessary before they could be admitted into the Theological School at Cambridge. Hence the idea of becoming useful as ministers of the gospel, is at once abandoned, and their otherwise useful talents are devoted to other pursuits. What I wish to propose to your serious consideration, as a remedy for this want, is, that an attempt should be made to open the Theological School at Cambridge, for the reception of young men of pious character and good natural talents, though destitute of all classical knowledge; that these should remain two or three years in the School; that theology, in an especial manner, should be an object of their study, in conjunction with all those branches of knowledge, which are immediately connected with this subject; that they should be taught composition, particularly in relation to sermonizing; that they should be initiated into the practice of extemporary preaching, which is a most important and valuable part of the theological course at Cambridge; and, in a word, that they should be taught every branch of knowledge, which can be acquired without an acquaintance with the Latin and Greek languages.

'I can easily foresee that some objections may be made to this proposal; but I am fully satisfied they will be of small moment, when compared with the immense advantages which would arise from its introduction. Some years ago the importance of such an object as this, was so much felt in England by the zealous friends of the Unitarian cause, that an institution of this kind was established at Hackney, under the superintendence of the truly pious and zealous Mr Aspland; from which several useful ministers have been sent out, who are now laboring in various parts of England. Let me therefore beg that you will give this subject an attentive consideration; and if it should meet your approbation, as I hope and trust it will, that you will introduce it to some of your zealous and active friends. It is not necessary that every minister should be a classical scholar. If one in ten of our ministers are deeply learned, it will be sufficient for the honor and success of our cause. Let such be established in our cities and large towns, where their learned and polished discourses will attract the attention of cultivated minds. But in the country, in nine cases out of ten, ministers educated as I propose, will be equally, if not more useful, than the elegant and polite scholar, and it is in the country where the want of ministers is most sensibly felt. In our large towns, where large salaries can be given, and polished society can be found, there will be little difficulty in obtaining ministers. But in the country, which will generally be deficient in both these respects, the difficulty will be great, unless we educate a class of men, whose habits and attainments are adapted to the circle in which they are destined to move. If this plan were introduced, we should in all probability have three students where we have now one: and thus would be brought into immediate operation, the collective talent of the Unitarian body.'

Theological School in Cambridge.—The Annual Visitation of this School, took place on Friday, July 11. The exercises by the students were as follows;—

MIDDLE CLASS.

1. On the Proper Test of Ministerial Faithfulness. *George Whitney.*
2. On Religious Controversy. *Cazneau Palfrey.*
3. The Progress of Religious Truth. *William Newell.*
4. The Effect of Free Inquiry on the Influence of the Clergy. *Hersey B. Goodwin.*
5. An Exposition of John xi. 35.—'Jesus wept.' *William Barry, Jr.*
6. An Exposition of Luke xx. 19—26. *Stephen A. Barnard.*
7. On Religious Poetry. *David H. Barlow.*
8. On the Causes of Infidelity. *Horatio Alger.*

SENIOR CLASS.

1. The Encouragements which this Country affords to a Faithful Ministry. *Moses G. Thomas.*
2. Pastoral Duties. *John L. Sibley.*
3. On the Leading Design of the Christian Ministry. *Artemas B. Muzzey.*
4. Should the Connexion between a Pastor and People be Permanent? *Samuel K. Lothrop*
5. The Influence of Christianity on the World. *Frederick H. Hedge.*
6. On the Differences in Religious Opinions among Christians. *Jonathan Cole.*
7. On the Study of Ecclesiastical History. *George P. Bradford.*

Unitarian Mission in Bengal.—[In our number for July and August, 1826, we published at length a letter from the Rev. Mr Adam, of Calcutta, giving an account of 'the principal facts, and circumstances connected with the present state and prospects of Unitarian Christianity in British India.' That letter, it seems, has also been published in Calcutta, and is the 'Brief Memoir' referred to below. At the General Meeting of the friends and supporters of Unitarian Christianity in Calcutta, of which we gave an account in our last number, the 'Unitarian Committee' of that city, read a report, which has since been given to the public under the title of the 'Second Memoir Respecting the Unitarian Mission in Bengal, &c.' We shall copy the whole of it into our pages, as the best means of putting our readers in possession of the most authentic information upon the interesting subject to which it relates. It occupies thirty six duodicimo pages, and we in this number present to our readers about two thirds of it, and we shall feel happy if it should succeed in attracting to the mission an attention better proportioned to its importance than any it has hitherto received.]

'Two years have elapsed since the publication of the "Brief Memoir respecting the Establishment of a Unitarian Mission in Bengal," which contained the first announcement made to the Indian Public that such an object was contemplated and that measures were in progress for its accomplishment. A Unitarian Mission had not then been established in Bengal, but it has since gone into operation, and its friends in India, in England, and in America, expect more information than they have yet received respecting what has been done, what is now doing, and what is proposed to be done for the promotion of its objects. The Calcutta Unitarian Committee which has been chiefly instrumental in calling the attention of Unitarians to the subject of a Foreign Mission, and which can alone be employed in this country in directing its operations and superintending its details, as the proper organ for communicating the information required, present the following Report.

'1. *Cooperation of Foreign Unitarians.*—The Committee, at their institution in 1821, deemed it their first duty to endeavour to secure *foreign aid*, convinced that such cooperation was necessary to the permanent prosperity of a Unitarian Mission in India. All other Protestant Missions derive the chief part of their resources from abroad, and all religious and philanthropic institutions, except Missionary ones and those patronized by the Government, are found to languish for want of support—an effect which arises from the comparatively small number of Europeans resident in India, and the constant fluctuations of English society; and which would be felt in a still higher degree in the case of a Unitarian Mission not enjoying foreign support, in consequence of the still smaller number of Unitarians, their liability to the same fluctuations, and the total want of sympathy with them among the professors of other christian denominations. The committee therefore lost no time in opening a correspondence with the English and American Unitarians with a view to secure their assistance in the establishment of a Unitarian Mission in Bengal, and thus to give full efficiency to their own exertions for that purpose, and they are happy to announce that they have in some degree succeeded, although after a greater delay than was originally anticipated.

'Various considerations have prevented Foreign Unitarians from engaging with the desired promptitude in a Mission to this country, among which the following, collected from the writings both of English and American Unitarians, may be briefly enumerated:—They regard the christian religion as the most powerful instrument that can be employed for promoting human virtue and happiness; but they do not consider the knowledge of it indispensably necessary to salvation; they do not believe that all those who are ignorant of it are doomed to certain and eternal condemnation, and they are thus deprived of that paramount motive which has brought other Protestant denominations within the last thirty years into the field of Foreign Missions. Unitarians have also been discouraged by the injudicious manner in which, as appears to them, Trinitarian Missions have been conducted, by the little success attending them, and by the knowledge that Unitarian Missionaries would not be received as coadjutors, but opposed as enemies. Their numbers and resources also are comparatively limited, although rapidly on the increase; they have to contend for the first rights of Protestants and of citizens against the declared and unqualified hostility of all other christian sects; and they are consequently as yet able to apply only a small portion of their means to foreign objects, after affording due support to their domestic institutions. To these considerations it may be added that some of the gentlemen to whom letters were addressed from this country, have labored under severe and continued illness occasioning unavoidable delay; and the Committee deeply regret to state as a further obstacle to the success of their endeavours, the fact of calumnious statements respecting the personal conduct and character of some of their own body having been propagated from this country by certain individuals both in England and America, which, before there was sufficient time to contradict and refute them, had contributed to cool the zeal and paralyze the exertions of the well disposed.

'For these various reasons the first communications of the Committee to the English and American Unitarians received but little attention. The first symptom of interest was discovered in a series of questions addressed by Professor Ware of Harvard University, United

States, on behalf of a number of Unitarian Christians with whom he was associated, to some of the members of the Committee, the answers to which, embodying all the information which could be obtained respecting the actual state of Protestant Missions in Bengal, were published, first in Calcutta, and afterwards at Boston, in America, where they excited very general attention to the subject which they treated. This was followed by a donation, from several individuals whose names were not given, of $375 towards the support of a Missionary, but which was placed at the disposal of the Committee for the General Purposes of the Mission; and by a further donation of $100 from the 'Association for aiding Religious Charities in Brattle Square Church,' Boston, which was added to the Chapel Fund. In February 1825, an Association was formed in Boston 'with a view to obtain and diffuse information respecting the state of religion in India, and to devise and recommend means for the promotion of Christianity in that part of the world,' of which Professor Ware was President, the Rev. Dr Tuckerman, Secretary, and Mr Lewis Tappan, Treasurer; and the first act of this Association was to remit six hundred dollars as their first annual contribution in aid of the funds for the support of a Missionary, with an engagement to continue it for three years certain. The sum thus received was also placed at the disposal of the Committee. In the course of the year 1826 various public meetings were held in Boston and numerously attended, the result of which was, instead of the Association just mentioned for obtaining *information*, the substitution of a 'Society for the Promotion of Christianity in India,' and a further remittance from that Society of 600 dollars towards the support of a Missionary, with a pledge to remit an equal sum annually for ten years, and the expression of a strong hope of being able to continue this contribution indefinitely. There has also been formed at Boston an 'American Unitarian Association' the object of which is to give union and efficiency to the whole Unitarian body in that country; and although it does not embrace foreign objects within its design, it seeks to maintain a friendly correspondence with this Committee, and has published two tracts powerfully recommending the cause of Foreign Missions to the support of American Unitarians. This cause is advocated in America by several of the most distinguished Unitarians—clergymen, professors, merchants, &c. It has frequently been introduced into the pulpit and is made the subject of investigation at the Associations of Ministers. Its claims are defended in the periodical publications of the denomination, and it has been made the theme of College exercises. It is the frequent subject of private as well as of public discussion, and although not an object of universal support, yet it is one of general and extending interest, among Unitarian Christians in America.

'For several years before the existence of this Committee, the English Unitarians had their attention called to British India by the exertions of Mr William Roberts at Madras. But the interest excited in favor of a Foreign Mission, was apparently limited and feeble; and the correspondence of this Committee did not produce any better effect until the publication in England at the expense of the London Unitarian Fund, of the answers to Professor Ware's questions, of which an edition was distributed gratis among Unitarian Ministers throughout England. In the early part of the year 1825, J. R. Freme, Esq. of Liverpool, remitted £35 as a donation towards the support of a Missionary from several friends at Liverpool and Manchester, of which £20 was added to the Chapel Fund, and £15 to the Fund for General Purposes; and about the same time a public subscription in aid of the Calcutta Mission was opened in England which ultimately amounted to £1579 2 2. In May, 1825, the British and Foreign Unitarian Association was formed, of which the promotion of Foreign Missions is one of the specific objects, there being a Foreign Secretary appointed to conduct the correspondence and manage the details belonging to that department. One of the first acts of this Association was a pledge to contribute 100 Rupees per month towards the support of a Unitarian Missionary for five years certain, with instructions to draw on their Treasurer for £100, which however it was not deemed advisable to do. In January, 1821, a remittance was received of £100 for General Purposes and of £15 towards the support of a Missionary, which was also added to the General Fund; and in May last the whole of the funds collected in England were received, amounting, with interest, to Sa. Rs. 17,091 9 8, of which

Sa. Rs. 1500 were for the support of a Missionary, Sa. Rs. 1562 1 8 in aid of the contingent expenses of the Mission, and the remainder towards the erection of the Chapel. In the letters which accompanied this remittance the British and Foreign Unitarian Association engaged to remit annually Sa. Rs. 1500 for the support of a Missionary, and Sa. Rs. 500 in aid of the Fund for General Purposes, the last mentioned contribution not to commence till the expiration of two years. The interest excited among the English Unitarians in favor of a Foreign Mission appears to be very general, embracing almost every congregation belonging to the denomination; the Unitarian periodical works advocate the cause of the Calcutta Mission; and sermons have been preached by some of the most distinguished ministers in furtherance of its objects. The correspondence on the part of the English Unitarians with this Committee has indeed been very tardy and irregular; but the sincere and general interest felt in the objects of a Foreign Mission is shown by the liberality of the pecuniary aid they have afforded, and by the number of individuals in different parts of the kingdom, whose subscriptions have contributed to swell the amount. The Committee are happy to state that, amongst others, Mr Belsham, the bosom friend and coadjutor of Dr Priestley and Mr Lindsey, with whose names his will be associated in the grateful recollection of every friend of pure Christianity, has lived to witness the commencement of a Unitarian Mission in India and to express his ardent aspirations for its success.

'The friends of Unitarian Christianity in India will perceive from the preceding statements, that the English and American Unitarians have adopted different plans in regard to foreign objects, the former having combined the prosecution of them with domestic objects by one and the same Association, and the latter having made them the business of a distinct Society. On the one hand there is a danger from the existence of two societies, one for domestic and the other for foreign objects, that an impression of opposition between them may be created, an effect which this Committee should deeply regret to witness, because they are convinced that the prosperity of the denomination in England and America will be the surest guarantee for the effectual prosecution of a Foreign Mission, and that the success of a Foreign Mission will have a most beneficial influence upon the state and character of the denomination in those countries. On the other hand there is a danger from the multiplicity of the objects of one Society that details will be neglected, the evils of which the Committee, in communicating with their English brethren, have already had occasion seriously to lament. Each plan is probably best adapted to the circumstances of the denomination in the country where it has been adopted, and while the Committee venture to express the hope that the evils of both will be avoided, they gratefully acknowledge the liberal and generous aid which they have received from Unitarians both in England and America. It is true that they have not rushed with a rash and impetuous zeal into the business of Foreign Missions. Most of them were probably at first inimical or indifferent to the object; then they learned to call in question the grounds on which their hostility or apathy rested; they inquired and obtained information; they reflected on the facts placed before them and discussed the subject in public and in private, in conversation and by correspondence, from the press and in the pulpit; and finally they have acted with a zeal and liberality which are well fitted to encourage and stimulate Unitarians in India. It may be regretted that they did not sooner perceive the christian duty they owe to heathen countries; but none can justly reproach them for it, for, until within the last twenty or thirty years, nearly the whole Protestant church was equally neglectful of this high duty, and Unitarians even now have left some branches of that church behind them in this good work. It may be regretted that much valuable time has been lost, and that in the interval some friends to the cause of Unitarian Christianity in India have grown cold; but it could not be expected that English and American Unitarians would give their active support to a Foreign Mission before they were convinced of its practicability and utility, or that a few having been convinced that there was a probability of permanent good being done, they could at once carry the whole denomination along with them in this persuasion. Now, however, that a deep and general interest has been excited among English and American Unitarians in favor of a Mission in this country, Unitarians here, knowing that

their decision has been formed after serious and mature consideration, may depend on their zealous and persevering cooperation with a degree of confidence which could not previously have been possessed.

'Having thus secured the cooperation of those Christians in England and America who assume the distinctive appellation of Unitarians, the Committee propose to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the publication of this Report, to open a correspondence with the Presbyterians of Ireland many of whom are known to be Anti-Trinitarians, and with the Free-Thinking Christians in England who are all Unitarians—with the Unitarians at Geneva and in Transylvania on the continent of Europe—and with the Christian Connexion, the Society of Friends, and the Universalists in the United States of America, most of whom are stated to believe in the simple unity of God. Individuals belonging to several of these bodies of Christians have already written to some of the members of the Committee, and it is hoped that most of them will be disposed, according to their ability, to contribute their aid for the promotion of education in India under the superintendence and control of this Committee.

'II. *Employment of a Missionary.*—The first object accomplished by the united contributions of the English, American, and Calcutta Unitarians, is the permanent engagement of a person competent to act as a *Unitarian Minister and Missionary* by devoting the chief part of his time to the business of the Committee, conducting the local and foreign correspondence, and putting into execution or superintending measures for the promotion of religion and education on the spot. The individual employed for the performance of these duties is the Reverend William Adam, whose engagement with this Committee commenced from 1st May 1827. It has already been mentioned that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association have offered permanently to contribute for this purpose 1500 Rs. annually, and the American Society for the Promotion of Christianity in India, 600 dollars annually for ten years certain; and it is now to be added that this Committee have formed a Missionary Fund, and from the accruing interest have agreed permanently to contribute to the same object 125 Rs. per month, the salary derived from these different sources amounting to about 350 Rs. per month. In consideration of the inadequacy of this salary to do more than afford subsistence to a European family without providing for their future wants, it has been expressly recognised by this Committee and the British and Foreign Association that Mr Adam is at liberty to devote a portion of his time to other than strictly religious pursuits, if they are not, in the judgment of this Committee incompatible with his Ministerial and Missionary character. Even the undivided labors of only one person cannot do full justice to the combined duties of Preacher to an English congregation and Missionary to the Heathen, especially as in the present case, where a Mission is not only to be carried on, but to be begun and its very foundations to be laid, and where, consequently, much of his time must be occupied in subordinate and preparatory details, and where, moreover, scarcely any are to be found who can spare even a small portion of leisure from their own professional engagements to aid in those details. The Committee therefore consider a coadjutor to Mr Adam highly desirable and indeed necessary to give efficiency to the Mission, and they earnestly hope that the exertions of the English and American Unitarians may be directed to supply this deficiency. In the mean time, it has been the endeavour of the Committee, in which Mr Adam has cordially concurred, to separate as much as possible the secular from the spiritual concerns of the Mission, to assign the care of the former exclusively to the other members of their own body, and to require from him only the appropriate and congenial duties of his station. The various sums received from England and America for Mr Adam's personal use, before the commencement of his engagement, were placed by him at the disposal of the Committee, who have applied them to the other purposes of the Mission.

'III. *Chapel for English Worship.*—The next object contemplated by the Committee, was the erection of a Chapel for stated worship and instruction in the English language, a measure which they believe to be strongly recommended by the following considerations. 1. One of the best ways to convince others of the truth and excellence of Unitarian Christianity, is for its adherents and professors to show that they wish, not only others but themselves and their families,

to live under the influence of its pure and salutary principles. The number of Unitarians resident in Calcutta has been found greater than the most sanguine expectations had anticipated, and it is gradually increasing by the accession of individuals from all classes of society; and the number is also considerable of Unitarians who come from the other parts of India, or from foreign countries, and remain here a longer or a shorter time for purposes of business. Hitherto Unitarians in Calcutta, whether permanent residents or transient visiters, have had no public place of worship to which they could conscientiously resort, no stated means of religious culture, and it is surely desirable for their own sakes, without any reference to its effects upon others, that, to supply this want, a Unitarian Chapel should be built in Calcutta. It is high time that Unitarian Christians in India, forming a distinct class of Protestant Dissenters, neither few in number nor confined to a corner, should have a place of worship which they may call their own. 2. But the measure becomes still more important when viewed in connexion with the Unitarian Mission which has been commenced in Calcutta. The labors of one or more isolated individuals to make known Unitarian Christianity to the natives, will attract little attention, and exert scarcely any influence; and to act effectively therefore upon the native community it is essential that Unitarians should become a regularly organized religious body. The existence of such a body exhibited by a regular attendance upon the weekly services of religion, and distinguished from other christian sects by the exclusive worship of One God in One Person, would be a *fact* which could neither be overlooked nor denied, and which would alone tend to remove many prejudices from the minds of Christians, Mohummudans, and Hindoos; while the discourses delivered would furnish the professors of other denominations and those natives who understand the English language, which most respectable Hindoos of Calcutta now do, with a better opportunity of knowing what Unitarian Christianity is, than perhaps any other means that could be employed. Such a congregation would be like a focus from which the light of pure religion would emanate in many different directions; for, without seeking to transform private Christians into proselytizing zealots, even the silent example of a firm, consistent, and public adherence to unpopular truth would alone essentially contribute to shake the foundations of error. Nor is it to be supposed that a congregation of Unitarian Christians would be indifferent to the employment of legitimate means for the diffusion of correct information respecting their religious sentiments. They would doubtless be willing according to their ability to aid the Committee with pecuniary means for prosecuting the objects of its institution; and the value or rather necessity of such aid will be duly appreciated when it is considered that Unitarians are without the pale of all other christian denominations, and enjoy none of that sympathy, assistance, or support which they mutually afford to each other. Every man's hand is against them. They must depend on themselves alone and draw their resources from their own body; and it is only through the medium of a stated and regular congregation that any permanent or considerable pecuniary aid can be derived from the Unitarians in this country. The Committee, convinced that without an appropriate place of their own for public worship, there will not be a permanent congregation, and that without a permanent congregation none of the advantages enumerated will be fully enjoyed, at an early date opened a subscription for the erection of a Unitarian Chapel in Calcutta. The amount subscribed in Calcutta is Sa. Rs. 13,033 9 9, but not more than half of that sum has actually been paid; a sum of Sa. Rs. 14,029 8, has been received from the British and Foreign Association, being the amount of the English subscriptions; besides £20 sent direct by Mr Freme, as already mentioned, and added to the Chapel Fund, and a sum of 100 dollars sent by Brattle Square Church Society in Boston, as formerly stated, which has been appropriated in the same way. With part of these funds a piece of ground consisting of one beegah and four cottahs has been purchased for 12,378 Rs. and vested in Trustees for the use of Unitarian Christians in Calcutta; and the remainder of the funds is in the hands of the Treasurer of the Committee. If the Calcutta subscriptions remaining unpaid were received, and an equal amount of additional subscriptions obtained, the Committee would commence the erection of the Chapel with some degree of confidence that they would be able to complete it, although even that sum

they consider would be insufficient to furnish it for public worship. The English Unitarians have subscribed far more liberally to this object than could have been reasonably expected of them, and the Committee therefore earnestly call the attention of the Unitarian public in India and America to the deficiency of the funds applicable to this purpose and to the importance of carrying into early execution this long pending measure. Every one who is desirous of giving permanence, consistence, and efficiency to a Unitarian Mission in this country will subscribe to the Chapel Fund. It is to this one point, after defraying contingent expenses, that all the pecuniary contributions of Unitarian Christians in aid of a Mission in India should be at this time directed, and the Committee therefore limit their call for pecuniary aid to this single object, and anxiously hope that its importance may not be overlooked.

'Until sufficient funds shall be obtained for the erection of a Chapel, the Committee have sought to gain the advantages of one by commencing Unitarian worship and instruction in a hired place. This has been done on two different occasions, first in 1821-22, and more recently during the present year. The first attempt was attended with an encouraging degree of success; but it was finally abandoned in consequence of Mr Adam having been placed under the necessity of engaging in a secular occupation for the support of his family. Since his relinquishment of that occupation and his resumption of the Missionary and Ministerial character, public worship, on the principles of Unitarian Christianity, has been recommenced at the Hurkaru Public Rooms. The form of worship employed is that of the Church of England, the Committee having adopted the Common Prayer Book used at the Unitarian Chapel in Essex Street, of which they commissioned a number to be sent, and have lately received 125 copies presented gratis by a member of the Unitarian body in London. The attendance at the Morning Service from the beginning of August to the end of October varied from ten to thirty individuals; and that at the Evening Service, which was substituted for it, has varied from fifty to eighty, which, compared with the average attendance at all Dissenting Chapels and at some Churches in Calcutta, the Committee regard as a pleasing indication of a desire on the part of a numerous and respectable portion of the community to be correctly informed respecting the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity. The subject of the Evening Lectures which are still in the course of delivery, is the Doctrine of the Unity of God considered in its various relations both to Trinitarianism and to Polytheism and Idolatry; and the Committee are happy to add that the endeavours used to draw the public attention to this great truth have, they believe, been materially aided by the discourses of Trinitarian Divines intended to counteract the effects of the Lectures delivered at the Hurkaru Rooms A considerable proportion of the congregation that assembles, besides several respectable and intelligent natives, consists of individuals who could not conscientiously, and therefore did not in fact, regularly attend any other place of worship; and, although none of course are excluded, yet the further accessions that are expected belong principally to the same class. They have not been drawn from other churches and chapels, and their attendance, therefore, on Unitarian Christian worship even in the estimation of the most hostile must be considered a clear gain to society and to the cause of Christianity. All who are desirous of promoting national religion and pure Christianity are invited to give their attendance at Unitarian worship where it is now conducted, and in the mean time the Committee will make every exertion to obtain funds by which they may be enabled to commence and complete the Chapel for the better accommodation of the public. The expense incurred by the maintenance of public worship amounts to upwards of 150 Rupees per month, including rent, &c., and is defrayed from the Fund for General or Contingent expenses which has been formed partly by public subscriptions and partly by remittances from England.

'IV. *Native Service.*—In the First Memoir the delivery of *Familiar Lectures* on religion in the native language and in the native parts of the city was contemplated, and the Committee still think this an object of great importance. By means of a Native Service, respectable and educated Hindoos will have an opportunity of acquiring plain and intelligible views of religion in general and of Christianity in particular; such a service will form a point of union between Christian and Hindoo Unitarians against

polytheism and idolatry; and even if no conversions are made, which indeed are not anticipated as the primary effects of the Committee's exertions, yet the stated inculcation of moral and religious obligations on rational principles, cannot but be attended with beneficial consequences both to individuals and to society. With these views a Native Service was commenced in October last and is still continued every Sunday morning. The order of the Service consists in offering a short extempore prayer; examining those who are present on the subject of the preceding Lecture; delivering another Discourse in continuation, and again joining together in a concluding prayer, after which every one is at liberty either to advance objections to what has been stated or to ask for further information. It was at first intended to conduct the service in the Bengalee language, but this was strongly objected to by the native members of the Committee, on the ground that the natives are not accustomed to use the vernacular tongue as a medium of instruction on literary and religious subjects, and that if an attempt were made to teach religion in Bengalee, the subject would be degraded and despised in consequence of the medium employed. They recommended the use of the English language, which the majority of intelligent Hindoos in Calcutta can understand, and in which they would consider it a mark of respect to be addressed. The English language, therefore, is principally although not exclusively employed in the Native Service; but it is designed gradually to introduce the use of the Bengalee to a greater extent, for the Committee are satisfied that if Bengal is ever to be enlightened, either by religion or science, it must be through the medium of the vernacular dialect. The Bengalee language is obtaining encreased attention from the natives themselves, and no one has contributed more than a learned native member of this Committee to elevate its character, purify its idioms, and recommend it as a medium of scientific and religious communication to his countrymen. The prejudice, however, against the Bengalee, is still so strong, and the rage for learning English so high, that the adoption of the latter at present, although not to the entire exclusion of the former, is deemed expedient; but the Committee are far from considering that the English language is the most proper medium for communicating knowledge to the great body of the people, however valuable an acquaintance with it may be to some as an accomplishment, or to others as a means of subsistence, and however important it may be to train up a limited number to a full and accurate knowledge of it, to be afterwards employed as the instructers of their countrymen.

'With regard to the course of instruction commenced and intended to be pursued, it may be remarked in general, that Missionary preaching has produced an effect on the minds of the natives upon the whole unfavorable to Christianity. It has excited prejudice, suspicion, jealousy against everything Christian. The utmost caution, therefore, must be exercised by the Unitarian Missionary, and his principal endeavours must be directed to lessen or remove this hostile bias. Instead of forcing Christianity on the attention of a congregation of intelligent Hindoos without reference to their age, dispositions, opinions, and degree of mental cultivation—which would be nothing less than a proclamation to them to disperse—it must be his object to produce a favorable state of *feeling* towards Christians and Christianity, without which the clearest evidence will make no impression and the most undoubted truths will find no resting place in the mind. With this view an attempt has been made, by plain arguments and familiar illustrations, to prove, explain, and enforce the being and attributes of God, his providence and moral government, and the various duties resulting from those doctrines, but without introducing Christianity; while at the same time Mr Adam has distinctly stated that he is a Christian, that his object is to promote Christianity, and that he will be happy to afford any information respecting it, that may be required of him. Hereafter, according as he finds his audience competent and willing to enter into such an investigation, he may deliver a separate course of Familiar Lectures on the comparative merits and demerits, excellences and defects of every system of Religion which professes to be a Divine Revelation,—Judaism, Mohummudanism, Hindooism, and Christianity,—leaving every one to come to a decision for himself; and in a state of more advanced preparation,

he may dwell at greater length on the Evidences, the Doctrines, and the Duties of the Christian Religion. Since the commencement of this Native Service the congregation has varied from 12 to 25, and although it is a matter of regret that so few of those Hindoos who have rejected idolatry appear disposed to give their countenance to the public worship of One God, yet the respectability, intelligence, and seriousness even of this small congregation, are very encouraging circumstances, and will, it is hoped, lead to a more general public profession of religion by Hindoo Unitarians. All the individuals composing it understand English, and almost all have received an English education. They attend from Sunday to Sunday at a fixed time and place, of their own accord, without any other motive or inducement but the desire to receive religious instruction. Throughout the service they join with reverence in the prayers addressed to God and listen with attention to the instructions delivered. And the occasional essays or abstracts which they prepare of the Discourses they have heard, the pertinent answers which they generally give when examined, and the further inquiries they make on the subject which has been treated, show that they both comprehend what has been said to them, and that they take a deep interest in it. Mr Adam, however, regrets that his other indispensable engagements have permitted him to give only a very limited degree of attention to this Native Service and to native labors generally, and grounds on this fact a strong appeal for a coadjutor in his Missionary and Ministerial duties. The place of meeting is one of the apartments in the range of buildings occupied by Rammohun Roy's Anglo-Hindoo School in that quarter of the city called Simlyah. It is very ill adapted to the purposes of public worship and instruction; but the Committee have reason to believe that the natives who attend the service, contemplate opening a subscription amongst themselves and their friends for the purchase of ground and the erection of a Native Chapel, to be appropriated to the worship of the One Living and True God.' *(To be continued.)*

Installation at Charlton.—The Rev. Edward Turner was on Wednesday, June 18th, installed as pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Charlton. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Noyes, of Brookfield; Reading of the Scriptures, by the Rev. Mr Alden, of Marlborough; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Walker, of Charlestown; Installation Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Huntoon, of Canton; Charge, by the Rev. Mr Thompson, of Barre; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr May, of Brooklyn, Conn.; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Osgood, of Sterling.

Installation at Salisbury and Amesbury.—On Wednesday, June 25th, the Rev. David Damon was installed as pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in Salisbury and Amesbury. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Osgood, of Sterling; Selections from Scripture, by the Rev. Mr Loring, of Andover; Sermon, by the Rev. Dr Thayer, of Lancaster; Prayer of Installation, by the Rev. Dr Andrews, of Newburyport; Charge, by the Rev. Dr Parker, of Portsmouth; Right Hand of Fellowship, by the Rev. Mr Lincoln, of Fitchburg; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Dr Flint, of Salem; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Dr Lowell, of Boston.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.—The emperor of Russia has undertaken the war against Turkey with great vigor. He has employed more than 300,000 men in this service, and has followed in person the movements of the main army. This army has crossed the Danube, and after taking several towns and fortresses of some importance, has advanced to the Balkan mountains, and laid siege to Chumla, a strong and populous town which guards one of the passes of the mountains, and also to Varna a town on the coast of the Black sea. A division of the army has captured Brailow, after an obstinate siege, and a bloody assault,

and another division has advanced to Silistria, and begun the siege of that fortress. Two Russian armies have entered Asiatic Turkey, and begun their conquests there. One of them crossed the Kouban, on the eastern side of the sea of Asoph, and by the aid of a fleet from the Crimea, has captured Anapa, a strong town with a Turkish garrison, in Great Abazia. The other army, which had lately effected the conquest of two Persian provinces, has entered Turkish Armenia, from the side of Persia, taken Kars by storm, and at the date of the last accounts, was threatening Erzerum, the principal town in that quarter of Turkey. The accounts from Constantinople, in regard both to the efforts made for the defence of the country, and the advances towards negotiation with the allied powers, are somewhat contradictory. The prevalent tenor of these accounts, however, is, that the spirit of the people seems to be broken, and that there is very little enthusiasm in the efforts which are made for the national defence. The ambassadors of Great Britain, France, and Russia, were on the point of meeting at Corfu, for the purpose of negotiating on the affairs of Turkey, and it was reported that the Turkish government had agreed to accede to the terms of the treaty of London, of July 6, as a condition of the mediation of the allied powers in terminating the present controversy.

Greece.—Ibrahim Pacha has entered into a stipulation with the admirals of the combined squadron of the allied powers, to evacuate the Morea, and to return to Egypt with all his army, as soon as transports for that purpose can be procured from Alexandria. A messenger has been sent to demand these, and the evacuation was expected to take place about the 1st of September. The Turkish troops which were in possession of the fortresses, were not included in the stipulation, and they would continue to hold those places. It was expressly stipulated, that Ibrahim should take away no prisoners, but that all Greeks held in captivity in the Morea should be set at liberty. Ibrahim declined negotiating for the restoration of the prisoners who have been carried to Egypt and sold into servitude, but it is stated that an agent is to be sent by the French government, accompanied by a naval force, to demand of the viceroy of Egypt, the restoration of all those prisoners. A military expedition has been fitted out in France, a part of which, consisting of about 8000 men, sailed from Toulon in August, for the Morea, to free from the foot of the enemy, such parts of that country as are yet held by the Turks. It is expected that one of the first acts of the Ambassadors at Corfu, will be to prescribe the limits of the new Grecian state, and that they will make other arrrangements for determining the character of the government and ensuring the tranquillity of the country. Count Capo d'Istria had received pecuniary aids from some of the allied powers, and he expected them from others. He had made some progress in organizing the departments of the government, but all efforts which had been made in military enterprises had been feeble, and had not been attended with any brilliant success.

Portugal.—An assembly, convoked by Don Miguel as the Three Estates of the kingdom, has declared him the lawful sovereign. He has therefore assumed the exercise of absolute authority, in his own right, and independently of the Constitution, which he had previously, in the capacity of Regent, sworn to support. The whole kingdom has submitted to this usurpation. The inhabitants of Oporto, with many distinguished individuals in other parts of the kingdom, for a short time endeavoured to maintain the Constitution and to resist the invasion of their rights, and of those of their lawful sovereign; but the party of Don Miguel was found too strong to be resisted. The Constitutional army suddenly dispersed, Oporto was occupied by the troops of the usurper, many of the Constitutionalists fled into Spain and other countries, and great numbers have been thrown into prison, and have suffered the most grievous persecution. The government of Madeira maintains its allegiance to its lawful sovereign and to the Constitution, and has sent back to Portugal the new governor, appointed by Don Miguel. A military and naval force is fitting out at Lisbon, to reduce this island to submission. The Azores have acknowledged Don Miguel, and received their new governor.

South America.—The war be-

tween Brazil and Buenos Ayres still continues, but it is prosecuted languidly. Negotiations for peace were still pending, at the last dates from Rio Janeiro, but with little prospect of a successful result. The republic of Colombia has thrown herself unreservedly into the arms of Bolivar, who has thrown aside the forms of the Constitution, and undertaken to administer the government according to his discretion. He has also declared war against Peru, which country had committed the double offence, of throwing off the yoke imposed upon them by him, and of sending an army into Upper Peru, to relieve the people of that country from the military government which he had established there, under the name of Bolivia. The city of Lima suffered severely on the 30th of March last, from a terrific earthquake, which destroyed a great number of churches and other buildings, and cut off many lives. In Central America, at the date of the last accounts, the two hostile parties had agreed to the conditions of a peace, but some difficulty arose, on the part of one of the commanding generals, in ratifying the treaty. We are yet to learn whether the country has been restored to a state of tranquillity.

OBITUARY.

Died, in this city, July 7, Henry Hill, Esq. aged 91.

Mr Hill possessed traits of character, which deserve to be remembered and imitated. He was a religious man; not fanatical or superstitious, but reverent and devout. His piety was not an austere, gloomy, repulsive principle, but a calm, cheerful, happy emotion. It was a feeling of reverence for the divine character, of submission to the divine will, of respect for the divine laws. Those who only saw him occasionally and of course knew him but superficially, might have concluded that a heart so light and playful, could not have been the residence of any deep and serious feeling. But they knew not the man. If piety consists in melancholy and gloom, then he had no just claim to the virtue. But if it consists in an habitual sense of God's presence and inspection, in reverence of his character, in gratitude for his mercies, in resignation to his appointments, and in an observance of all the ordinances of religion and means of grace, then he had a claim to the character of a religious man. Contentment dwelt in his bosom, and the accents of praise and thankfulness to God were ever upon his lips. 'His enjoyments,' he was accustomed to say, 'had been many; his pains and afflictions few.' While recounting the gifts and mercies of providence, he would exclaim, 'I have been one of the happiest of men; I have had everything to make me so; the best of friends, and the best of all God's blessings.' He was remarkable, too, for his equanimity and patience. It was difficult to ruffle his temper, or disturb the uniform tranquillity of his mind. He bore suffering and affliction, as a Christian should bear them, without a repining thought or a complaining word. Lying as he did for many months, feeble and helpless, he exemplified, in his last sickness, some of the finest traits of the christian character, and taught all around him a lesson of patience, of contentment and of gratitude, which will never be forgotten. He was a kind hearted and benevolent man. His charity beginning at home, his numerous relatives found in him at all times a steady friend and unfailing benefactor. Under his hospitable roof they found a joyful welcome—and many who had no claims of brotherhood found there a peaceful asylum.

Of his habits of life, I think it useful and proper to mention his unparalleled temperance. It was a temperance so habitual and complete, that some would denominate it abstemiousness. It was an abstinence, too, not merely from excess in one particular, but in all. During a long life he abjured altogether the use of distilled liquors, and ever rose from his table with an unsated appetite, and consequently with a clear head and a tranquil mind. Difficult as it is to determine with certainty the causes of longevity, there can be little doubt that the deceased was es-

sentially aided in reaching so advanced an age, by his uniform equanimity and temperance. Having no anxiety of mind, and cherishing within him none of the common causes of disease, he lived on without any violent shock being offered to his system; and when he fell away, it was the inevitable decay of nature, the ruin of mortality. He was a healthy, active, vigorous man for upwards of ninety years, because he was at peace with God and his own conscience, and because he never transgressed the bounds of moderation. The result was, the singular fact, that he never summoned a physician to his aid, and never permitted one to approach him, in his professional capacity.

As to his religious sentiments, Mr Hill was a decided Unitarian. Educated a Trinitarian and a Calvinist, he was led by the study of the bible alone, to embrace a more just and liberal theology. Familiar with the scriptures, and well acquainted with the arguments of the controversy, he took delight in avowing and vindicating the simple truths of Unitarian Christianity. He understood religion too well, and felt it too deeply, to be exclusive and bigoted. He was remarkable for his tolerance and charity. When inquiring the character of an individual, he never thought of asking what were his theological opinions, or at what church he worshipped; but his sole question was, 'Is he good? Has he the christian spirit?' In his own family, persons of different religious persuasions lived together for years in harmony and peace; and he was accustomed to speak of this as a delightful evidence that true and genuine religion may be found everywhere, among all sects—that religion which 'is peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.'

The principles of Unitarian Christianity, which occupied his mind and heart in health and in prosperity, cheered him in the time of affliction, and supported him when on the bed of sickness and in the near prospect of death. His trust was in the free love and unpurchased mercy of his heavenly Father, as they are revealed to us by his blessed Son. He had no ecstasies and no raptures in his last hours, but he looked forward with a tranquil and humble hope, to the time of his departure.

Such was the life, such was the death, of this excellent old man. He lived long and he lived well. He has now gone to his fathers in peace. He has been 'buried in a good old age.' To his relatives and his numerous friends he has left behind him pleasant recollections and consoling hopes.

'Why mourn ye that our aged friend is dead?
Ye are not sad to see the gathered grain,
Nor when their mellow fruit the orchards cast,
Nor when the yellow woods shake down the ripened mast.

'Ye sigh not when the sun, his course fulfilled,
His glorious course, rejoicing earth and sky,
In the soft evening, when the winds are stilled,
Sinks where his islands of refreshment lie,
And leaves the smile of his departure spread,
O'er the warm colored heaven, and ruddy mountain head.

'Why weep ye then for him, who, having run
The bound of man's appointed years, at last,
Life's blessings all enjoyed, life's labor done,
Serenely to his final rest has passed;
While the soft memory of his virtues, yet
Lingers like twilight hues, when the bright sun is set.

'His youth was innocent; his riper age
Marked with some act of goodness every day;
And watched by eyes that loved him, calm and sage,
Faded his late declining years away.
Cheerful he gave his being up, and went
To share the holy rest that waits a life well spent.

'That life was happy; every day he gave
Thanks for the fair existence that was his;
For a sick fancy made not him her slave,
To mock him with her phantom miseries.
No chronic tortures racked his aged limb,
For luxury and sloth had nourished none for him.

'And I am glad, that he has lived thus long,
And glad that he has gone to his reward;
Nor deem that kindly nature did him wrong,
Softly to disengage the vital cord.
When his weak hand grew palsied, and his eye
Dark with the mists of age, it was his time to die.'

Bryant.

Erratum.—Page 259, eighth line from the bottom, for 'fate,' read 'fall.'

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—No. V.

SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

ORIGINAL LETTERS ADDRESSED TO COTTON AND SAMUEL MATHER.

[A friend has put into our hands the following letter to Cotton Mather, written in 1725–6 by his correspondent in England. The original is in the Library of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, and the copy from which we print was made by C. C. BALDWIN, Esq. the Librarian.]

'*Ottery*,* *March* 10, 1725–6.

'REV. AND DEAR SIR,

'Your most kind and welcome letter of the 31st December 1724, came too late to my hand to return you my thanks for it by the ships that went to New-England the last spring. But though the intervals be so long, I am unwilling to drop so excellent and grateful a correspondence; for it gives me an uncommon joy to receive a letter from your hand; and your last letter was a double pleasure as it enclosed another from my most valuable namesake, though it tempted me, I fear, to some degree of pride, that we had one of the family left, that deserves a better character than any of the same name on this side the water. But enough of this, lest I lead him into the same temptation.

'I return you my hearty thanks for such variety of useful composures as you are pleased to send me; and in particular for the Life of your dear and admirable parent, now with God, who was so long a burning and shining light in this dark world.

* Ottery is a market town in Devonshire.

'I rejoice to hear of the increasing and flourishing estate of the churches of New-England, which are very dear to me. And I can assure you that I sympathized with you most tenderly when I received your last letter, for I was under the same exercise in my own congregation, on the account of the new tunes of psalms, that vexed and ruffled some of your churches. And many other congregations have been very near to fatal rupture, by the devil's subtilty, even by so minute a circumstance.

'I am glad that the seeds of Arianism or Socinianism have not yet been sown in your soil, and pray that the Lord of the harvest may ever prevent so mischievous an evil, which has never failed to deluge those churches where it has been received and encouraged.

'The prime Arian of the Dissenters in England,* happens to have his seat in the west of this kingdom; who, since he found he could not propagate his heresy by controversial writings, now endeavours to insinuate his leaven by paraphrases and commentaries on books of scriptures; and having published a dangerous comment on the Epistle to the Colossians, the last year, has now spawned another, worse than that, on the Epistle to the Philippians; and in his notes on the second chapter, has declared sentiments concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, that he was the angel of Judea, which was his province, as another angel presided over Persia, and others over other countries, grounding this wild notion on Daniel's *King of the North and of the South;* that the other angels opposed his kingdom as not knowing his particular favor with God; but after his death and resurrection, he was rewarded for his sufferings, by being made an archangel, and so had power over the other angels, whom he triumphed over, and led them captive into heaven; applying that of the Psalmist, *He ascended up on high, and led captivity captive, &c.* to the good, and not the evil, angels whom he went with into heaven as his train, having conquered them in the opposition they had made to himself as angel of Judea, through ignorance,—with more of this wild stuff; and what he will publish next of this kind, time will show.

'And both these comments are dedicated to the present Lord Chancellor. In which dedication he expresses his great admiration, and imitation *of that great man Mr Locke*, who was the head of the Socinians and Deists in England.

'Much infidelity abounds over all our realm amongst the great men, and diffuses itself through all parties, ranks, and professions among us, which makes sad the hearts of Christ's disciples.

* 'The prime Arian of the Dissenters,' was the learned James Peirce, of Exeter; and the Lord Chancellor, to whom his Paraphrases were dedicated, was the celebrated Sir Peter King, nephew of Mr Locke, who left him half his library.

And as a fruit of this, a loose and libertine spirit appears everywhere more and more, though it be boldly opposed by all the faithful.

'But Mr Bradbury now writes me that in London they are under a new alarm from Mr Watts' book on the Trinity, which seems to open a Socinian scheme upon us, before we had well got out of the hands of the Arians. Two pens are at work against him. So that as he represents it, the luxuriant fancy of that man will do the church more hurt by his divinity, than it has done it service by his psalmody and poetry.

'And I have another complaint to make to you, for I vent my grief into your tender and sympathizing bosom, that many of our young men seem much inclined to Pelagianism, which evil they have very much contracted by Dr Whitby's Comments and Limborch's Theology, which are put into their hands by some of their Heterodox and unwary tutors. *O tempora! O mores!*

'And, which is as bad, if not worse than all, real, vital, spiritual religion dies away among us in a spirit of indifferency and lukewarmness, and under the prevailing love of gain and pleasure in a long day of outward peace and prosperity. So that we seem to need very severe rebukes from Heaven to humble and awaken us.

'And will debauching masquerades and lewd plays, so much delighted in, and countenanced by persons of the highest station, make us better? I fear whither we are running, both in principle and practice; so that perhaps if we are not severely scourged, we are undone.

'Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure. The Lord knoweth those that are his. There is a remnant that believe his truth and fear his name; and in London and many other towns, there is a most laudable spirit of charity, and a zeal in the societies for reformation to suppress outward crimes and immoralities.

'I pray God to continue your valuable life and labors in his church, till he shall raise up others fit to succeed you, and till you have done your work and are rendered every way meet for your everlasting rest.

'Please to convey the enclosed to my worthy relation, and be so good as to bring the author of this into remembrance in your prayers, that he may be found faithful, who desires to be reputed,

'Reverend Sir,

'Your most affectionate and obliged
brother, and humble servant,
Jo. Walrond.'*

* As to the writer, Walrond, we have not been able to obtain any information. He speaks of his 'most valuable namesake,' as living in this country. But the

'Mr Ball, who is now past seventy, but yet most highly useful in his ministry and example, his learning and piety, sends you his most affectionate service.

'I bless God he is still lively and vigorous in his work, and has been honored as an happy instrument to oppose our Arian errors.'

[The above letter is interesting and valuable from the view it gives of the opinion entertained at the time it was written of the religious sentiments of Locke, Watts, and Whitby, those brilliant ornaments of the Unitarian faith, and the two last of whom became converts to it at a late period in life, after a patient and prayerful examination of the subject, and in opposition to their preconceived and recorded opinions. The statements in this letter are the more important, because they are incidental, private, and from one who was a cotemporary and an opposer. From his account it appears that Locke was regarded in 1725 as 'the head of the Socinians and Deists in England,' Dr Watts' book on the Trinity was thought to 'open a Socinian scheme,' and the commentary of Whitby 'inclined the young men to Pelagianism.' These declarations corroborate, what no man who has carefully examined the evidence can doubt, that these three distinguished men were Anti-trinitarians and Heterodox. By their Orthodox cotemporaries they are stigmatized as heretics, and excluded from their pale. It is a vain attempt, on the part of their successors at the present day, to draw the exiles back again within their narrow inclosure.]

[We have obtained from the same source another letter written by the same individual to Samuel Mather, the son of Cotton. Although not so interesting as the preceding, we shall insert it, on account of the view which it gives of the state of religion in England in 1731. It is worth noticing that the middle or moderate party among the Dissenters, was the most numerous.]

'*Exon.** *July 28th*, 1731.

'Dear Sir,

'The sight of a letter from the son of such a father, my excellent friend and correspondent for about twenty years, was very affecting to me, and revived in me a delightful thought of that reverend and heavenly person, now with God.

'I rejoice to see that he has left such a valuable relict and successor in the ministry as yourself, who I hope will be his image

name of Walrond is not to be found in any of our historical books. It is not in the Index of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. It is possible that it is the same with Waldron, a name i high esteem in New England at the time this letter was written. There was a William Waldron, minister of the New Brick in this town from 1722 to 1727; and this may possibly have been his 'worthy relation.' Mr Baldwin, who has lately made a copious and complete index to Cotton Mather's Magnalia, an Herculean task, writes to us—'I can say with safety that the name of Walrond is not in the Magnalia of my old favorite, Cotton Mather. I have nearly completed an index (*uberrimus*) to Hutchinson's Massachusetts, and it is believed that it does not appear there. He subscribes his name very legibly.'

* The Latin name of Exeter.

as well as his son, and inherit the graces and virtues as well as the prayers and blessings of his pious ancestors.

'I thank you very kindly for your most acceptable present of your sermon and the Life of your dear father, whose death was a deplorable loss to New England, and much surprised me, who had put it far off upon the foolish reason of his father's long life. I am sorry you can give me no better account of the state of religion with you, and I wish I could give you any better of Old England. But certainly, as bad as it is with you, it is worse with us, who do not hold the truth or righteousness, but are much corrupted both in faith and manners. However, I bless God that there is a good remnant among us, that have kept Christ's truth, and not denied his name. With us that are called Dissenters, are three sorts, such as are fallen from the faith into Arian or Arminian errors, such as are very sound, and a middle sort, the most numerous, that profess the same faith, but are so indifferent about it, and indulgent to the erroneous, that they seem to be with us in principle, but with *them* in interest, loving them better with their errors, than others with the truth as it is in Jesus. And as to the life and practice of religion, there we all fail, and may be ashamed.

'I should be glad to hear how the Church of England Missionaries behave amongst you, and in other parts of America; for very honest well meaning men contribute zealously to them in these parts as well as in London. How does your University flourish, and what does it produce? Who succeeds your most valuable father in Boston? These, with whatever other intimations you shall please to give me, will be very acceptable to

'Dear Sir,

'Your most affectionate brother
and humble servant,
JOHN WALROND.

'I am glad to see so good first fruits of your labors. May you go on with the divine assistance and blessing to be a burning and shining light in America.

'Accept a small present from me. *The Texts of Scripture Compared* was drawn up by your unworthy servant.'

RECOLLECTIONS OF A SERMON.

'We shall all be changed.'

The voice comes faintly from yon insect throng,
Whose riot in the dusty sunbeam, held
For one brief hour, sums up their fleeting life.
The voice is whispering from the summer leaves;
It sighs along the lowly grass—its breath
Is wafted on the gentle wing of even,
Alighting on the closing flowers that spread
Their beauty to the sun of yesterday,
And ere another evening, shall have passed
Like a forgotten thought. The voice is borne
On the low murmur of that shallow stream,
Nursed by spring showers, consumed by summer's drought.
The voice of change comes from the shivered oak,
Whose knotted limbs creak to the passing blast,
And utter forth a warning of the hour
That hastes to lay the forest sovereign's head
Low in the dust. The solemn voice of change
Comes from the mountain tops which first gave back
The splendors of the new-created sun—
Whose clefts have shouted to the thunder's tone
For ages gone. The voice of human change,
Breathing immortal hope, is borne to heaven
From the low bed of poverty and pain,
Where lies the dying saint—it bursts in joy
And holy gladness from the martyr's lips,
Who welcomes death for truth—it lifts the soul
Of the pale messenger of love, whose life,
Spent in his Father's work, is waxing low.
He hears the voice, and girds himself afresh,
And cheerful waits in faith *his* hour of change.

W. R.

REVIEW.

ART. XI. *Lives of the Twelve Apostles; with Explanatory Notes.* By F. W. P. GREENWOOD, Junior Minister of King's Chapel, Boston. Hilliard, Gray, Little, & Wilkins. Boston. 1828. 12m. pp. 148.

THIS is a pleasing and useful work. The narrative is easy, and the incidents well arranged; and there is simplicity, beauty, and force in the trains of reflection in which the author occasionally indulges. The latter, with some digressions in which he now and then allows himself, form very attractive parts of the performance, containing views equally just and affecting, and always expressed with terseness and point.

The subject is an interesting one, the lives and fortunes of those 'excellent men,' who were selected by Jesus to be the companions of his travels, who shared his confidence, and heard from his own lips, those heavenly truths, which now, after eighteen hundred years, continue to light millions on their way to virtue, to happiness, and to God. Of the history of these favored few, only imperfect accounts have been transmitted to us. Of some of them we hear little beside their names, in the sacred writings; of others more is told us, but still much is left to conjecture. Their characters are presented only in their dim and shadowy outlines, the occurrences of their lives are sparingly related, and after the sacred writings fail us, little light remains to assist or reward our researches. The injuries of time have spared enough to excite, without gratifying our curiosity. Of the writings of Hegesippus, the earliest ecclesiastical historian, and who lived near the times of the apostles, unfortunately only a few fragments have come down to us, preserved chiefly by the care and diligence of Eusebius. The latter, early in the fourth century, complains of the great paucity of materials for the early history of the church. The scanty and imperfect records to which he had access, age has since mutilated or destroyed. Of fables and romances and traditionary legends we have enough among the Fathers before and after his days, and they may contain a few insulated truths, but mixed up with so much extravagance and error, that they can with difficulty be distinguished. In fact, to separate them from the immense mass of falsehood with which they are incorporated, exceeds the ability of the most sagacious critic, and the task must be forever abandoned in despair.

Cave, in his 'History of the Lives, Acts, and Martyrdoms of the

Holy Apostles of our Saviour and the two Evangelists, Mark and Luke,' a monument of his learning and piety, has collected, we believe, all, or nearly all, which is worth extracting from ancient records on the subjects of which he treats. He writes with much honesty and fairness, and though as a Protestant, he may be supposed to have felt a strong repugnance to the pretensions of the Romish Church, and was led, in the course of his work, to combat the positions and assertions of some of its champions, he uniformly manifests a spirit of moderation and candor. He cannot, however, be wholly acquitted of the charge of credulity. His narratives are encumbered with gossipping rumors utterly unworthy of being related, he often goes into details which are quite tedious, and his style is far from being attractive. Altogether his performance is not adapted to popular use.

Lardner, in his 'History of the Apostles and Evangelists, Writers of the New Testament,' is more critical and discriminating. His work is excellent of its kind. But neither is Lardner's a book designed, or fitted for popular reading. Both together, however, furnish an important storehouse, from which a master of the graces of style may derive ample materials capable of forming the groundwork of several pleasing biographical sketches. We regret that Mr Greenwood has not permitted himself to draw more liberally from these, and similar sources. No one is more capable than he of working up the rough materials they afford into a beautiful and fascinating narrative. We know not that we have any cause of complaint against him. His work might have been rendered more learned, but it might have lost in proportion its attractions. He wrote to be read, to please, to edify, to nourish and strengthen good affections, to excite and gratify a taste for a species of history in the highest degree interesting and profitable, but hitherto too much neglected, and what he attempted, he has certainly accomplished. He has furnished, not a work of profound criticism or of deep research; this was not wanted. But he has given us a performance, from which no one, learned or unlearned, can rise without benefit and pleasure. So far as the scripture accounts conduct him he is full, and we think, in the main, exceedingly judicious. He has seized on the incidents which are most instructive, and his delineations of character are striking and true. When deserted by these guides, he is occasionally a little too sparing of information, occasionally betrays a little carelessness, and, in a few instances, falls into error, not, however, sufficient very materially to impair the value of the work.

The Lives are preceded by an Introduction, in which Mr Greenwood speaks of the motives of Jesus in calling the twelve apostles, and the interest their history is fitted to excite.

'Who were those, in the first place, whom the Saviour of men, the Prince of Peace, the Son of God, chose out of the whole world, to be his companions, his pupils, his witnesses, his historians, his apostles, his friends? What were their qualities? How were they recommended to the notice of Jesus? What were their occupations, their condition, education, principles? It was a remarkable station which they were called upon to hold; so near the person, so high in the confidence of the most exalted being who ever appeared on our earth. As disciples ourselves, though it may be unworthy of the name, and as distant from *them* in merit as we are in time, yet as professed disciples of that heavenly Master, we are naturally curious to learn more than simply the names of our favored predecessors. We would make ourselves acquainted with those men who saw, and heard, and touched, and lived, and conversed with, that holy prophet of God, for whom we feel a reverence only inferior to that which we entertain toward Him who sent him.

'And who were those, we would ask, in the second place, who were appointed by Jesus Christ to publish his religion, and enabled by the assistance of the holy spirit of God to publish it successfully? Who were those, who, in obedience to their Master, went out into all nations, teaching, converting, and baptizing, and planting the parent churches of our faith in learned Greece, and lordly Rome, and benighted Africa, and among those rude people of the North from whom we ourselves are descended? It was no mean work in which they were employed. No revolution of recorded time can equal it in glory; for thrones were subjected to its power, and the poor and humble of the earth were raised by it to an elevation, for which thrones would have been an inadequate substitute. They, like their Lord, were invested with a control over the operations of nature; and more than that, they, like him, and by his authority, and with his instruction, founded an empire the most broad and lasting which has ever existed, over the human mind. Who were they? As Christians, as subjects of that empire, as men amazed, at the same time that we are rejoiced, at what we have heard and what we behold, we are impelled to inquire who they were, who established a dominion which has already covered the civilized world, and is apparently going on, with ever encroaching steps, to spread itself over the whole earth? If the lives of any men are interesting, theirs must be peculiarly so. They are the great reformers, the great conquerors, whose empire has been continually increasing and strengthening, while the houses and dynasties of heroes and kings, have risen, and flourished, and passed away into forgetfulness and ruin; the only empire which has grown more vigorous and more hopeful with age, because the mind and the heart and the destiny of man, and the good providence of God, are joined to support and perpetuate it. Who were these men?' pp. 11, 12.

The life of Simon Peter, whose name uniformly appears at the head of the apostolic list, stands first in the volume. He formed a prominent figure in the little group assembled around the person of our Lord. His forward and impetuous temper, his ardent attachment to his master, his energy and firmness, which procured him the emblematic name of Cephas, or Peter, a Rock, and lastly, his age, contributed to bring him often into notice, and laid the foundation of that precedency he obtained among the apostles. Of the twelve he is most frequently mentioned, and his charac-

ter most fully discloses itself, in the sacred histories. Mr Greenwood gives us the following short description of some of his distinguishing traits.

'Peter's character now rapidly unfolds itself; a character of strong and contrasted features; bold, honest, and vehement, and yet wavering and inconstant; now forward and daring before all his companions, and now more timid than any of them. Wherever we meet with him, it is the same Simon that we see; distinguished alike for high and generous virtues, and for faults inconsistent with those virtues and altogether unworthy of them. Strength and weakness, courage and irresolution, impetuosity and indecision, are mixed up in his temperament in a striking and yet perfectly natural combination; and at the bottom of the whole, there is a purity of feeling, and an integrity of purpose, which endear him to his Master, and fit him at last for his important destination and office.' p. 18.

Of Peter's travels after he left Judea, probably about the year fifty, till his arrival, some years after, at Rome, no accounts, which can be depended on, have been handed down to us. Epiphanius informs us, that he was often in Pontus and Bithynia; and Origen, as quoted by Eusebius, observes, that he 'is supposed to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia; who finally coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downwards, for he requested that it might be in that manner.' Cave supposes that he arrived at Rome in the year sixtythree, and Lardner sixtythree or sixtyfour of the christian era. This date is probably not far from the truth. We hear of him perpetually in Judea till near the year fifty, about which time, or a little before, the apostolic synod was holden at Jerusalem, at which he was present. He soon after visited Antioch, and may then have passed into the above named countries, all of which are mentioned at the beginning of his first Epistle. Thence probably he went to Rome. There is good reason for believing, that he suffered martyrdom in the year sixtyfour, or sixtyfive of our era, in the beginning of Nero's persecution. He could therefore have been at Rome only a short time, one or two years at most. Nicephorus, comparatively, however, a modern writer,* and not entitled to the utmost credit, fixes the time of his 'episcopate' there at two years. Mr Greenwood has not done full justice to this subject. Peter 'is said,' he observes, 'to have been bishop of Rome for twentyfour, or twentyfive years,' nor does he hint, except in a note, at the end of the volume, that the truth of this report has ever been doubted. The assertion originated with Jerome, but appears wholly destitute of support. It is impossible to reconcile it with the accounts we have of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, and the incidental notices of him in the Epistles of Paul;

* He wrote early in the fourteenth century.

the turn of expression employed by Origen in the passage already quoted, certainly does not favor it, but the reverse; and Nicephorus and Lactantius, or the author of a work usually ascribed to him, expressly contradict it. In fact, the supposition is attended with numerous and insuperable difficulties, and the evidence against it from antiquity is so strong, that it has been rejected as unfounded by several Romanists, inferior to none in a knowledge of ecclesiastical chronology.*

We are unacquainted with Mr Greenwood's authorities for supposing that Peter was originally buried in the 'Catacombs.' There is a tradition, that his body was embalmed after the Jewish manner, and buried on the Vatican Mount; that a small temple was erected on the spot, on the destruction of which by Heliogabalus, it was removed to the cemetery on the Appian Way, two miles from Rome, whence it was reconveyed to the Vatican in the time of Pope Cornelius, A. D. 251, and that the temple was afterwards rebuilt and enlarged by Constantine in honor of the apostle's memory. This tradition derives support from one or two circumstances, which we think deserving of notice. That Peter, executed as a criminal, should have been buried on the Vatican Hill, the scene of his crucifixion, is in itself in the highest degree probable; for the place was, at that time, held in little esteem by the Romans, on account of its bad air and all sorts of filth collected there. The church mentioned as erected over the spot, must have been a rude structure. Its destruction by Heliogabalus may seem to need explanation, and may appear, at first view, somewhat improbable. But history has preserved a fact, which renders it quite probable. Heliogabalus, we are told, first brought the Vatican Mount into repute, by clearing away the rubbish and removing the causes of its unhealthiness. It was during this process, undoubtedly, that the 'small church' alluded to, was destroyed, and the relics of Peter removed to the Catacombs. This striking, and as Paley would call it, 'undesigned' coincidence, we do not recollect to have seen noticed.

'His family,' says Mr Greenwood, 'consisted as far as we can ascertain, of Simon himself, his brother, and his father, his wife and her mother.' He afterwards observes, 'it is probable that he was a married man.' That he was once married is certain, for his wife's mother, is expressly mentioned in the Gospels. Some Romish writers have asserted, that he left his wife on becoming a disciple of Christ. But it has been inferred from an expression of St Paul, that she accompanied him on his travels, and Clemens of Alexandria mentions her martyrdom.

* This point is argued at some length by Cave, in his English Lives, and resumed and pursued in a subsequent work, Script. Eccles. Historia Literaria.

For a description of Peter's person and features, we refer those who have any curiosity on the subject, to a note at the end of the volume before us. It is entitled to about as much respect, we suppose, as the story of his meeting Jesus after his escape from prison in Rome, and his return to his cell, when, being asked by him whither he was going, Christ replied, 'To Rome, to be crucified a second time;' or numerous other traditions concerning him, as the report of his carrying the gospel to Babylon and Chaldea in the East, and Britain in the West. The portrait is given by Cave on the authority of Nicephorus, and partly, as it seems, of Jerome, who quotes from a spurious work, called 'Clemens' Periods.' The peculiar appearance of the eyes, 'black, but spect with red,' Baronius attributes to his frequent weeping!

Of Andrew, Peter's brother, and the second on Matthew's list, little is said by the sacred historians, and Mr Greenwood has allotted to him only three pages. In the distribution of provinces supposed to have been made by the apostles, Scythia, we are told, was assigned to Andrew. An ancient writer has left a particular account of his travels, but from what source he derived his materials is unknown, and the credit due to his narrative, therefore, must be determined by the internal marks of probability or of improbability it exhibits. It is said, that having traversed the countries bordering on the Euxine Sea, he penetrated into the remote solitudes of Scythia; that at Sinope, on the banks of the Euxine, he met with his brother Peter; that while there the Jews rose upon him, treated him with great barbarity, beat him, and dragging him out of the city, left him for dead; that he revived, and afterwards went to Byzantium, Constantinople, and having founded a church there, ordained Stachys, mentioned by St Paul as his 'beloved Stachys,' Rom. xvi. 9, the first bishop,—a fact asserted by Nicephorus Callistus, and by another Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, but which the reader is at liberty to admit or reject,—that being afterwards banished from the city, he preached the gospel in several parts, and finally came to Patræ, in Achaia, now Patras, an archiepiscopal see, where he sealed his testimony with his blood. That such, or something similar, may have been his track and fortunes, is not improbable. Of his death by crucifixion we have no reason to doubt. We are told that Ægeas, Proconsul of Achaia, being irritated at beholding the numbers who went over from Paganism to Christianity, in consequence of Andrew's preaching, after some ineffectual attempts to silence him, caused him to be committed to prison; that he earnestly entreated him to renounce the new superstition, as it was then called,

and save himself; that the apostle persevered with great constancy and courage to declare his adherence to the faith of Jesus, in whose cause he professed himself ready to suffer; that sentence of death after scourging was then pronounced against him. He proceeded to the place of execution with a composed and cheerful air, the people, as he passed along, 'crying out, that he was a good and just man, and unjustly condemned to die.' That his death might be more lingering, he is reported to have been fastened to the cross by means of cords. He remained, it is added, two days upon it, instructing the people, and exhorting them to constancy and perseverance. The cross on which he suffered, is affirmed to have been what is called a *cross decussate*, constructed of two pieces of timber intersecting each other at acute angles, in the form of the letter X, hence called St Andrew's cross. His body is said to have been embalmed and honorably buried by the pious care of Maximilla, a lady of quality, whom Nicephorus, on what authority he does not inform us, makes the wife of Ægeas, and says that she, as also his brother Stratocles, had previously become converts to Christianity, a circumstance, he adds, which greatly inflamed the rage of the proconsul against Andrew. His body, we are told, was afterwards removed by Constantine, and deposited in the great church at Constantinople.

The next in order is James, called the Greater, to distinguish him from another apostle of the same name. We offer no apology for the length of the following extract from his Life.

'Here I cannot help requesting my readers to pause a moment, and consider the fortunes, the singular, and, if the word were holy enough, I would say romantic, fortunes of these four men. Simon and Andrew, James and John, brethren of two different families, dwell together with their parents, in a village at the northern extremity of a lake or small sea, in the district of Galilee, and on the confines of the land of Judea. The sea is a large sea to them, and to them the towns, which here and there dot its coast, and the light barks, which, for the purposes of amusement, or traffic, or their own calling, skim along its pleasant waters, are the world. They are fishermen. Day by day do they rise up to the contented exercise of their toil, to throw their nets, to spread their sails, to ply their oars, and, when successful in pursuit, to dispose of their freight in their native village, or the neighbouring towns, for the support of themselves and their families. They are friends; they have joined themselves to each other in their humble profession, and agreed to share profit and loss, storm and calm, together. Their low roofed dwellings look out on each other, and on their native lake, and within these dwellings are bosoms which throb anxiously at their protracted absence, and beat gladly at their return. Their boats contain all their wealth, and their cottages all that they love. Their fathers, perhaps their ancestors, were fishers before them. They themselves have no idea of a different lot. The only changes on which they calculate, are the changes of the weather and the vicissitudes of their calling; and the only great interruptions of the even courses of their lives,

to which they look forward, are the annual journies which they take, at the periods of solemn festival, to the great city of Jerusalem. Thus they live, and thus they expect to live, till they lie down to sleep with their fathers, as calmly, as unknowing, and as unknown as they.

'Look at them, on the shore of their lake. Think not of them as apostles, as holy men; but look at them as they actually were on the morning when you first hear of them from the historian. They have been toiling through a weary night, and have caught nothing; and now, somewhat disheartened at their ill success, they are engaged in spreading their nets, washing them, and preparing them, as they hope, for a more fortunate expedition. Presently, surrounded by an eager crowd, that teacher approaches, whom they have before seen, and whose instructions some of them have already listened to. With his demeanour of quiet but irresistible dignity, he draws toward the spot where they are employed; he enters Simon's vessel, and prays him to thrust out a little distance from the land; then he speaks to that assembled multitude as never man spake; then he bids Simon launch out further, and cast his net in the deep; then follows the overwhelming draught of fishes; and then those four partners, filled with wonder and awe, are called to quit their boats, and throw by their nets, and become fishers of men.

'And now what a change, like the change of a dream or of enchantment, has passed over their lives, dividing what was, from what was to be! It was long before they themselves were aware how entire and how stupendous it was. In a few years, they are to be the principal actors in the most extraordinary events of recorded time. Home, kindred, country, are to be forsaken forever. Their nets may hang and bleach in the sun; their boats may rot piecemeal on the shore; for the owners of them are far away, sailing over seas to which that of Gennesereth is a pond; exciting whole cities and countries to wonder and tumult; answering before kings; imprisoned, persecuted, tortured; their whole existence a storm, and a greater one than ever swept over their lake. On the peaceful shore of that lake, even their bones may not rest. Their ashes are to be separated from the ashes of their kindred. Their blood is to be sprinkled on foreign soils; the headsman and executioner are to preside over their untimely obsequies. A few years more, and the fame and the doctrine of these fishermen have gone out into all lands. Magnificent churches are called by their names. Kingdoms adopt them for their tutelar saints; and the men who claim to succeed to the office of one of them, rule for centuries over all civilized kingdoms, with a despotic and overshadowing sway, and by virtue of that claim give away a continent, a world, which, when their predecessor lived, was entirely unknown. History tells us of a fisherman of Sicily, who was raised to that island's throne; but who will compare that, or any earthly throne, to the twelve thrones which were set up over the twelve tribes of Israel? What is a king of Sicily to an apostle of Christ? A wonderful man has risen up in our own, as we call it, wonderful time, risen up from a moderate station to the empire of Europe; and yet the eight volumes which another wonderful man has written of that emperor's deeds and fortunes, have not preserved, and cannot preserve, such a name for his hero, as is secured by hardly more than eight lines, which tell us of those men who first fished for their living on the Sea of Galilee, and then were called to be the apostles of Christ.' pp. 43—46.

There is an improbable and extravagant tale, forged, as it would seem, by the writers of the middle ages, which supposes James to

have carried the gospel into Spain, and even to Britain and Ireland. It is of a piece with another, which informs us, that his body, after his death, being put on board a ship designed to carry Ctesiphon to Spain, the ship, without oars or pilot, glided rapidly over the waters, and in seven days arrived at the destined port, whence the body was miraculously conveyed through the air twelve miles from the shore, where it was interred; that it was afterwards transported to Compostella, that 'store-house of miracles,' as Baronius calls it, where it has worked innumerable wonders. It is almost certain that he never left Judea. He was put to death by Herod Agrippa. The fact is thus mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. 'Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church; and he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword.' xii. 1, 2. He is termed the Apostolic Protomartyr, the first of the little band, who was called to attest his fidelity by his death, thus partaking of the cup, of which he had long before told his master that he was able to drink.

The fourth on Matthew's catalogue is John, the brother of James, 'the last named, though certainly not the last in merit, of those four friends and partners, the fishermen of Bethsaida,' the disciple towards whom Jesus felt particular affection, and to whose care, in his dying moments, he committed his mother. In the partition of provinces made by the apostles, Asia, according to the testimony of Origen, fell to John. There, as tradition says, he discharged the office of an apostle with great fidelity and success, till a persecution breaking out under Domitian, A. D. 95, he was sent by the proconsul to Rome, and is reported by Tertullian to have been thrown into a cauldron of burning oil, from which he escaped unhurt, or, as Jerome says, 'stronger and healthier than he went in,' a ridiculous fable, which only proves to what a pitch of credulity the Fathers of that age, even the best of them, had arrived. He was afterwards banished to the isle of Patmos, in the Ægæan sea, where he is reported, according to the vulgar account, to have written the Revelation. After the death of Domitian he was permitted to return to Ephesus, where, it is said, he wrote his Gospel at the request of the bishops of Asia, and where he finally ended his days, placidly falling asleep in Jesus, as it is generally supposed, about the year one hundred of the christian era, at the age of one hundred years, or very near it. It is quite certain that he survived all the other apostles; that his life was protracted till the time of Trajan, who succeeded Nero in the year ninetyeight of the vulgar era; that he escaped martyrdom,

the general fate of his companions, and that he was buried in or near Ephesus. *

Some modern writers have supposed, that the mother of our Lord accompanied him to Ephesus. Others, among whom are Cave, Basnage, and Lardner, are of opinion that she died before he left Palestine. This, Nicephorus affirms from preceding historians, and Eusebius fixes the date of her death at the year forty-eight, fifteen years after our Lord's ascension. Mr Greenwood has not noticed this discrepancy, but observes simply, 'she is supposed to have died at Ephesus.'

Numerous absurd traditions concerning John have been handed about, one of which we have already mentioned. Another is, that being, in company with some others, about to enter the bath at Ephesus, he inquired of the servant, who was within? and being told that the heretic Cerinthus was there, says one, Ebion, says another, it is not improbable both, says honest Cave, he fled with precipitation, saying, 'Let us be gone, and make haste from this place, lest the bath wherein there is such a heretic as Cerinthus, the great enemy of truth, fall upon our heads.'

It is generally reported, and Tertullian and Jerome affirm it, that he was never married. The latter mentions a circumstance, which harmonizes well with the affectionate character of the apostle, and the general strain of his writings. When from age and weakness he was no longer able to preach, he caused himself, on every public occasion, to be led to the church, where he said no more than, 'Little children, love one another;' and when his auditors, wearied with the constant repetition of these few words, asked him why he always spoke the same thing, he replied, 'Because it was the command of our Lord, and that if they did nothing else this alone was enough.'

The fifth named by Matthew, is Philip, also a native of Bethsaida, situated on the banks of the beautiful lake Gennesereth, or Sea of Galilee. History has furnished us with but few particulars of his life. All that we can gather, is, that 'Upper Asia' was assigned as his province, which gave rise to the opinion, that he planted the gospel in Scythia; that he made many converts, and after some years came at last to Hieropolis, a wealthy and populous city in Phrygia; that having condemned the superstitions of

* Dorotheus, who wrote in the third, and Chrysostom, in the fourth century, assert that he lived to the age of one hundred and twenty years. But this assertion is opposed to the current tradition of antiquity, and seems entitled to no credit. Others, such is the propensity of human nature to the marvellous, propagated the fable, that he never died at all, imagining that he was either translated, or lay sleeping in his grave. The latter was a current story in the time of Augustine.

the place, and procured the destruction of an idol worshipped under the form of a serpent, as tradition says, he was seized by the magistrates, condemned and scourged, and afterwards hanged by the neck against a pillar, though there have not been wanting those, who say that he came to his death by crucifixion.

Of Bartholomew, the sixth in order of the apostles, only the name is mentioned in the Gospels, unless, as has been conjectured, he is the same with Nathaniel. He is said to have carried the knowledge of Christianity into India, where he left a copy of Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew. Pantænus, a christian philosopher, originally of the sect of Stoics, a learned man, and preceptor of Clemens of Alexandria, and who flourished near the end of the second century, is reported by Eusebius, to have found it there, and mentions a tradition current among the inhabitants, that it was brought there by Bartholomew. From India we are told that he passed into Phrygia, and was with Philip at Hierapolis at the time of his martyrdom, and himself narrowly escaped crucifixion. We next hear of him in Albanopolis, or Albanople, as Cave writes it, in Armenia, where we are informed that he was put to death on the cross. There is a rumor, not, we suppose, entitled to much credit, that he was first flayed alive, and another equally uncertain, that he was crucified with his head downwards.

We come next to Thomas, the same, who, on witnessing the sudden appearance of his master after his resurrection, exclaimed, 'My Lord and my God!'—an expression of astonishment and surprise, about which there have existed strange misapprehensions. Mr Greenwood thus expresses himself on the subject.

'By many, though by no means by all of those who hold the doctrine of the perfect equality of the Son with the Father, it has been adduced as a scripture proof of that equality; as an acknowledgment by the apostle, of the godhead and supreme divinity of Jesus Christ. To this interpretation of the passage, there seem to me to be insurmountable objections. In the first place, the question of the deity of Christ has no concern with the event. It was not to be satisfied of the deity, but of the resurrection of his Master, that Thomas required his appearance; and it was to convince him of that resurrection, that his Master condescended to appear to him. "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." Believe what? What the disciples had just told him, certainly, that they had seen the Lord, that he was truly alive, not that he was truly God. Secondly, it is difficult to conceive how the appearance of Jesus, in a human form, just as he had always appeared before, and with bodily wounds, just as he had been taken from the cross, that is, as a man in all respects, could have convinced his disciple, and that disciple a Jew, that he was the eternal God. The miracle of the resurrection itself could not have had this effect, because Thomas had often witnessed the miracles of his Master,

without once confessing that he was God; and no other evidence was at this time offered. Thirdly, if Jesus was on this occasion acknowledged to be God, it might be expected that the writer of the narrative should take some notice of the circumstance; but what are his words, immediately after relating this event? "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is *the Christ, the Son of God,*' not God himself. Fourthly, the exclamation itself is abrupt, and without any connexion to determine precisely its meaning. It might not have been addressed to Jesus at all, but to God alone; or the first appellation might have been addressed to him, and the second to Heaven; it was an exclamation, in short, of wonder, of ecstatic wonder, of ecstatic gratitude, and just such a one as any of us would be likely to utter on witnessing a similar marvel; such, for instance, as the resurrection of a dear friend from the grave. Fifthly, if the whole exclamation was really addressed to Jesus, the term God might well have been applied, according to known Jewish usage, and in its lower sense, to one who now had manifested undeniably that he was the Messiah, the Prince of Peace, the Son of God, and the King of Israel. Lastly, the answer of Jesus himself excludes the supposition that he was addressed as the Supreme God. For he said unto his disciple, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Now this must mean, "Because thou hast seen me here alive, after my crucifixion and burial, thou hast believed that I am raised from the dead; and it is well; but blessed are they who cannot have such evidence of the senses, and yet shall believe in the glorious truth, from your evidence and that of your brethren." He could not have meant, that they were blessed, who, though they had not seen him, yet had believed that he was God; because there is no connexion between the propositions; because the fact of the resurrection of Jesus cannot, to the mind of any one, be of itself a proof of his deity; and, because no one thinks of requiring to see God, in order to believe that he exists. In conclusion, it must be remembered, that these considerations are so obvious, that they have been fully adopted by some of those who still have professed their belief, founded on other evidence, of the deity of Christ.' pp. 74—76.

Origen informs us that Thomas took Parthia for his province. It is said, that he preached the gospel also to the Medes, Persians, Hyrcani, Bactrians, and others; that he passed through Ethiopia in the East,* and penetrated into India 'as far as Taprobane †

* The ancients gave the name of Ethiopia to every country of which the inhabitants were of a black or tawny complexion. By the Ethiopia here mentioned, called Oriental or Asiatic Ethiopia, ecclesiastical writers seem to have understood a country far in the East, it is not quite certain what. Cave must be mistaken in supposing it Chaldea, or conterminous with it. He seems to have been led into the error by the circumstance that Tacitus, His. lib. v. c. 2, mentions the Jews as descendants of the Ethiopians, from which he appears to have inferred, that by Ethiopia was meant 'Ur of the Chaldees,' the birthplace of their ancestor Abraham. But the inference is unauthorised. Tacitus, in the passage alluded to, evidently refers to the Ethiopians of Africa, though classical writers sometimes included under the term, Persia, Chaldea, Assyria, and several other countries of Asia, as well as several parts of Africa. The question, however, is not in what sense classical authors occasionally used the term, but what the christian Fathers, and writers of ecclesiastical history understood by it in this connexion; a question, which it is of very little consequence to determine.

† Now Ceylon, not Sumatra, as Cave has it.

and the country of the Brachmans.' The Portuguese report a tradition, as current among the Christians of India at the time of their arrival, that having incurred the displeasure of the Bramins by his efforts to erect a church and his success in obtaining converts, they resolved to destroy him, and watching an opportunity, when he retired to a tomb, whither he was accustomed to repair for the purpose of private devotion, they, with their armed followers, rushed upon him, and loaded him with darts and stones, and that one of them, at last, run him through with a lance. This took place at Malipur, or Meliapour, now St Thomas, on the Coromandel Coast. His body was taken up by his followers, and buried, we are told, in the church then recently erected. It has been asserted, that it was afterwards removed to Edessa; but the Christians of the East constantly affirmed, that it always remained at the place of his martyrdom.

The St Thomas, or St Thomé Christians, who were found near the Malabar Coast by the Portuguese, early in the sixteenth century, and who had been long cut off from all intercourse with christian nations, claimed the apostle as their founder, and maintained that there had been a regular succession of Christians there from his days to their own. They possessed the New Testament in the Syriac language. They rejected the supremacy of the pope, and the doctrines of transubstantiation and purgatory, and long resisted all efforts to reduce them into subjection to the Church of Rome; but their spirits were at length broken, and a nominal union took place. They are said to have been Unitarians.*

The eighth named is Matthew himself. Of his travels after he quitted Judea nothing can be ascertained with certainty, so entirely is the truth lost in a multitude of fables. Ethiopia in Asia is mentioned by Socrates as his apostolic province, where he is said to have terminated his life, at a city called Naddaber, as an ancient writer affirms, by martyrdom, though Nicephorus makes him die a peaceful death, and Dorotheus says that he was honorably buried in Parthia, one of the first places where he preached the gospel. † Such is the impenetrable obscurity which hangs over his history.

It is matter of some uncertainty when Matthew's Gospel was

* For some account of this interesting sect, see Christian Disciple, New Series, vol. ii. p. 88.

† Heracleon also, a learned Valentinian writer of the second century, places Matthew among those apostles, who did not die by martyrdom, as also Philip, Thomas, and Levi, by whom he is supposed to have meant Lebbeus, that is, Jude. But, with regard to two at least of the four, his testimony has been generally allowed to have little weight.

written. There are three dates, however, one or another of which has been usually assigned. Among ancient writers, Theophylact and Euthymius, who wrote in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, contend for the year fortyone of the vulgar era, eight years after the ascension; Nicephorus, who flourished in the fourteenth century, affirms that it was written in the year fortyeight, fifteen years after the ascension; while Irenæus, * who lived in the second century, says, that it was written while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, that is, some time after the year sixty of our era. Modern writers are also divided on the subject. Baronius, † Grotius, G. J. Vossius, ‡ and Wetstein, || are in favor of the first mentioned date, A. D. 41; Cave of the second, A. D. 48; while Fabricius, § Mill, ¶ and S. Basnage, are disposed to confide in the testimony of Irenæus, who, as the most ancient writer, seems entitled to greatest respect, and Lardner and Bishop Marsh also decide in his favor. Mill assigns the year sixtyone as the time when the Gospel in question was probably written, and Lardner sixtyfour, or possibly sixtyfive, a little more than thirty years after our Lord's death, and during St Paul's second residence at Rome. Bishop Marsh does not attempt to define the precise date of its composition, though he is very confident that it was written at a late period, and while St Paul was at Rome. 'If the arguments in favor of a late date for the composition of St Matthew's Gospel, be compared with those in favor of an early date,' he observes, 'it will be found, that the former greatly outweigh the latter. The evidence in favor of a late date is ancient, whereas the evidence in favor of an early date is modern. A writer of the second century, as Irenæus was, had surely better means of information in respect to a fact in the first century, than any writer could have, who lived in a later age.' ** Kuinoel, too, is in favor of a late date, for he supposes Luke to have written first of all the evangelists, and assigns the year sixty as about the time of the composition of his Gospel. He afterwards refers to the testimony of Irenæus, apparently with approbation, and consequently must have believed that Matthew's Gospel was written about the year sixtythree or sixtyfour. Those who have rejected this date, have relied chiefly on arguments *a priori*, in opposition to the testimony of Irenæus, 'the most ancient evidence on the subject, and contradicted by

* Adv. Hær. l. iii. c. i. † Ann. Eccles. t. i. p. 286. ‡ De Geneal. Christi. Opp. t. vi. p. 59. Amst. 1701. || Nov. Test. t. i. p. 223. Amst. 1751. § Bibliott. Græc. l. iv. c. 5. ¶ Proleg. 61.

** Marsh's Michaelis, vol. v. p. 98. Lon. 1802. Michaelis also 'inclines to abide by the testimony of Irenæus,' though he does not appear to have any very decided opinion on the subject, and finally suggests, that the different accounts may be reconciled, by supposing that the Gospel was originally written in Hebrew about the year fortyone, but that the Greek translation did not appear before the year sixtyone or later. Vol. iv. p. 161.

none of the Fathers of the first five centuries.' We are not quite satisfied with the manner in which Mr Greenwood has disposed of this topic.

The history of James the Less, the ninth in order of the apostles, as their names are arranged by Matthew, is somewhat intricate and perplexed. Lardner observes, that he found it a difficult task to write it, having tried 'more than once, and at different spaces of time.' He is supposed to be the same afterwards called James the Just, and bishop of Jerusalem, though some have hesitated to admit it. Assuming this as probable, however, a question arises concerning his parentage. St Paul expressly styles him 'the Lord's brother,' Gal. i. 19, and the testimony of the Jews of Nazareth to this point, as reported by the evangelist Matthew, is very clear. 'Is not this the carpenter's son; is not his mother called Mary; and his brethren, James and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?' xiii. 55. James, then, and the others named with him, were reputed, by the Jews of Nazareth, where Jesus was brought up, to be his brethren, and were so considered by St Paul. Origen mentions a tradition, that they were the children of Joseph by a former wife, and thus properly termed Christ's brethren; and such was the opinion of Eusebius and Epiphanius, and, it seems, of the majority of the ancient Greek Fathers. They are spoken of as the sons of Mary, apparently the same as the mother of Jesus; but this, observe the advocates of the opinion just stated, was not unnatural, she being their father's wife. Again, James is called the son of Alpheus, but this, say they, might be only another name for Joseph. Cave thinks this a true account of the matter. Lardner inclines to the same opinion, which is also asserted by Basnage and Vossius among Protestants, and Valesius among the modern Romanists.

There is another opinion on the subject, which supposes that James and Joses were the sons of Mary, sister of Mary the mother of Jesus; that they stood, therefore, in the relation of cousins to him, but were called brethren according to Jewish usage, which confounds the degrees of brother and cousin. This opinion, which we believe has been generally received by the Latins, seems to have originated with Jerome, but is opposed, as we have seen, to a more ancient tradition, and to the opinions of the earlier Fathers. It is advocated by Mr Greenwood, but to his argument drawn from the manner in which the three or four 'weeping females' are mentioned standing about the cross, it may be plausibly objected, that it supposes neither Matthew nor Mark to have noticed the presence of the mother of Jesus at the crucifixion, an omission which it seems difficult to explain. Why should they mention

three others, and omit the person of chief interest in the group—one to whom the attention of spectators must have been drawn by the affecting words of Jesus addressed to his mother, 'Woman, behold thy son,' and to the disciple, 'Behold thy mother?' But difficulties press upon both suppositions; which of them is the more probable, we leave others to determine.*

James seems to have remained at Jerusalem and to have presided over the church, or body of believers there, greatly respected by Christians and by the better class among the Jews. His virtues procured him the epithet of 'Just.' He was conspicuous for his piety, and there is a tradition that by constantly kneeling in acts of devotion, his knees became worn to the hardness of a camel's. That he perished by a violent death, cannot be doubted, but accounts differ as to the manner of it. According to Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, he fell a victim to the rage and malice of the Jews, and was killed in a popular tumult. It happened, he says, in this manner. The Scribes and Pharisees, with other Jews, knowing that he shared the confidence of the people and could sway their opinions at will, placed him on the battlement of the temple, and required him thence to address the multitude then assembled at the passover, and persuade them to believe that Jesus was not the Christ. But, instead of gratifying their wishes, he bore testimony in favor of Jesus, in a loud and distinct voice, upon which, instigated by disappointment and hatred, they threw him from the place on which he stood, and as he was not killed by the fall, they caused him to be stoned, and a blow from a fuller's staff at length put an end to his sufferings. Some circumstances of this narrative are very improbable. Jortin pronounces it 'no better than a legend.' It is reasonable, however, to suppose that it has some foundation in truth. That James either perished in a sudden affray, or that his death was procured by the machinations of some leading men among the Jews, of whom was Ananus, the high priest, hardly, we think, admits of a question. It is added that he was buried on the spot where he fell, and that a monument was there erected to his memory. Jerome mentions an opinion entertained by some of his day, that he was buried on Mount Olivet, but says that it was a mistake, that he was buried near the

* That James and Joses, and Simon and Judas, were not the sons of Mary, the mother of Jesus, has been inferred from the circumstance, that the latter, in his dying moments, committed her to the care of the 'beloved disciple,' John. But we are not quite sure, that this inference has not been hastily drawn. However improbable it might, at first view, seem, that Jesus should request John to discharge the filial duties towards his mother, provided she had sons living, the supposition is by no means intrinsically incredible. The circumstance here alluded to, is the principal evidence with which we are acquainted against it, and it presents a difficulty, it is true; but is the difficulty such as to authorise us to reject the supposition as not entitled to examination?

temple where he was thrown down. Gregory, bishop of Tours, 'a famous romancer,' says Jortin, tells us that he was buried on Mount Olivet, in a tomb which he had built for himself, and in which he had buried Zacharias and old Simeon. He is supposed to have been put to death, if Hegesippus' account is to be credited, about the year of Christ sixtytwo, 'being taken away,' as we are informed, 'to the great regret and grief of all good men, and of all sober and just persons even amongst the Jews themselves.' Our present copies of Josephus contain a passage relating to his death, but the genuineness of a part of it at least, is strongly suspected.

The following just remarks occur at the close of Mr Greenwood's Life of this apostle.

'There is one epistle, among the canonical books of the New Testament, which is very generally ascribed to James the Less, the brother or cousin of Jesus. It is a noble exhortation, full of good sense and spirit, dignified, independent, and explicit. Its value is of the highest estimate, both as it is an unreserved declaration of the intrinsic merit and importance of good works or virtue, and as it contains a most fearless, indignant, and forcible denunciation of the reigning vices and follies of the generation to whom the apostle wrote. A common opinion among the ancient writers of the church, is, that the first part of it was composed expressly to explain those passages of Paul's epistles which seem to slight good works, and make everything of faith, or mere belief; and that the severe rebukes and warnings which are contained in the latter portion of it, were the chief occasion of the writer's being stoned to death by the Jewish populace, as that event is supposed to have taken place a short time after the publication of the epistle.

'That the encomium of James on good works was intended to explain some of those things in Paul's writings which were hard to be understood, is not improbable; but that it is in direct opposition to them, as some have thought, is not only improbable,' but impossible. For it is impossible to read Paul's description of charity, in which he declares that it is greater than both faith and hope, and still to believe that he would so directly contradict himself as to reverse this order, and exalt faith above charity; or that he intended by what he calls works, and the works of the law, what we mean by good works and christian morality or virtue. The world have been too long, and much too vehemently disputing about the relative superiority of faith and works, and arraying James against Paul, and Paul against himself. It was, perhaps, a strong bias toward one side of this controversy, or rather a bigoted and dogmatical attachment to it, quite as much as any doubts of the genuineness and antiquity of James's epistle, which induced Luther to call it, in contempt, "an epistle of straw." Despite, however, of this coarse epithet of the Reformer, it has maintained its authority in the christian church; an authority, which, if intrinsic excellence and internal evidence have any weight, it amply deserves.' pp. 91, 92.

Next follows Jude, or Judas, also called Thaddeus, or Lebbeus, the tenth on Matthew's catalogue, and one of those who are mentioned as the brethren of our Lord, and who Nicephorus says was the son of Joseph. Few notices of him occur in the historical books of the New Testament, and little can be gleaned from

other sources. No authentic account of his travels has been preserved. He is said to have preached the gospel in Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia, where, as the Latin writers generally assert, he was for a time very successful, but having incurred the enmity of the Magi, by openly and boldly condemning their superstitions, he was cruelly put to death. But this is at least doubtful. Dorotheus says that he suffered martyrdom, and was honorably buried in Berytus, and Nicephorus affirms that he calmly and peacefully ended his days at Edessa. One short epistle, reputed to be his, has come down to us.

The eleventh is Simon, styled by Matthew and Mark the Canaanite, and by Luke, Zelotes, the Zealot. When we have said that he was an apostle of Christ, we have told all that is with certainty known of him. Tradition is almost silent respecting him. He is said, on the authority of Nicephorus, to have turned his steps towards Egypt, and to have traversed several provinces of Africa, then to have sought the Western Islands, penetrating into Britain, where, it is added, he was 'crucified by the infidels and buried.' Others pretend that he suffered martyrdom in Persia. Both accounts may be equally fabulous. The former, especially, bears the stamp of an extravagant fiction.

The name of the traitor, Judas Iscariot, stands last on the list.

'There is a solemn obscurity,' remarks Mr Greenwood, 'hanging over the life of this man, shrouding everything in silent and immoveable shadow, except one deed of gigantic enormity, which raises its high and desert head, and frowns in gloomy solitude over the surrounding waste of darkness and clouds. He is called the son of Simon. Who is Simon? Search the scriptures for him. The search will be vain. He is only known, as has been forcibly said, *only* known by the misfortune of having such a son.' p. 98.

After following him through his dark career of avarice and crime, till the account closes with those thrilling words, 'he departed and went and hanged himself,' Mr Greenwood observes;—

'I know not how others may feel on perusing the history of this wretched man, but for my own part, I confess that my indignation is plentifully mingled with pity. How dark was the close of his short career! How terrible was the punishment of his guilt—death by his own hands! The price of blood lies scattered at the feet of the priests; the betrayer has come to his end, even before the betrayed; his apostleship is ended; no softened multitude will listen to the tidings of salvation from his lips; no converts to a pure and purifying faith will bow to receive the waters of baptism from his hands; no countries will contend for the honor of his grave; no churches will call themselves by his name; no careful disciples compose his limbs; no enthusiastic devotees gather up his bones. His dust is scattered to the winds; his name is only preserved by its eternal ignominy. He was a martyr—the first martyr—but it was to avarice. He

has had his followers, too; but they have been only those, who, as wicked and as wretched as himself, have, from that day to this, and in the countless forms of selfishness, sold, for a few pieces of silver, their consciences, their Saviour, and their souls.' pp. 187, 188.

Throwing out the name of Judas, we shall not probably be very wide of the truth, when we say, that of the eleven apostles who survived their master, seven, Peter, Andrew, James the Elder, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, and the other James, appear from testimony which is entitled to respect, to have suffered martyrdom; three by crucifixion, one by the sword, one suspended by the neck against a pillar, one thrust through with a lance, and one by stoning or beating with a club. With regard to three of the remaining four, Matthew, Jude, and Simon, there is some doubt, though the evidence we can gather on the subject, so far as any exists, seems to favor the supposition of a violent death. Only one, John, is certainly known to have been permitted quietly to sink to rest.

The Lives are followed by some concluding remarks, equally just and beautiful. We give the following extracts; we are sure our readers will find no fault with the length.

'In the first place, the apostles were all Galileans; natives or inhabitants of the district of Galilee. This country constituted the northern portion of Palestine, and its people, though hardy and brave, were not much respected by the Jews of Jerusalem, who regarded them as illiterate and unpolished, and unworthy of producing a prophet. The Pharisees, reproving Nicodemus for the interest which he expressed in Jesus, said to him, tauntingly, "Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look; for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." The very speech of the Galileans was a provincial dialect, and betrayed their remoteness from the capital; as we have seen was the case with Peter in the palace of Caiaphas. In short they were looked down upon by the more cultivated, and, if I may use the epithet, *Attic* part of the nation, as a rude, unenlightened, Bœotian branch of the common Jewish family. Jesus, though born in Bethlehem, was brought up in Nazareth, which was the most despised town in this most despised province; and therefore in selecting Galileans to be his apostles, he selected those who were nearest to him, and with whom he was most familiar. And yet what materials were they for constructing and building up a new religion, which was to be the wonder, the beauty, and the glory of the earth! How little adapted they seem to be for their lofty destination! They are the last men, these poor Galileans, the very last men, as we should suppose, to confound the learned, to resist the mighty, to convert the world. They do not seem to be made for such a work. There is no fitness in them to be instructers and reformers. Their very birthplace forbids it. The choice of them, therefore, to be the intimate disciples of Christ, and the founders of a new religious system, appears to me to be a mark of the divine mission of Christ, and the divine character and origin of Christianity. To my ear the language of it is this: The person, who, undertaking to introduce a peculiar and original faith to the world, selected, or, as it would rather appear, took almost carelessly up, his associates and confidential coadjutors, from his own neighbourhood, from his own kindred, from the shores of a lake, from the streets of a vil-

lage, from before his own door-stone, instead of seeking out the learned and the powerful from among the Pharisees and chief men of the nation, must have set out in his work with the assurance that there was a Power and a Wisdom above, which could and would supply every deficiency among his followers; and the event proved that the deficiency *was* supplied from a divine, all sufficient, and only sufficient Source.' pp. 110, 112.

'There is one other circumstance in the lives of the apostles, which I am bound to notice for the sake of its singularity and importance; and then I will leave them to the meditations and further inquiries of my readers. I have several times had occasion to speak of the national prejudices of these men, and the difficulty which they had to comprehend the entire spirituality of their Master's system and kingdom, and to admit into their associations with the Jewish Messiah and Saviour the ideas of poverty, lowliness, suffering, and death. Attached as they were to him by all the ties which we have enumerated, we see that when he was actually apprehended by his enemies, they all forsook him and fled; that they did not return to him; and that on the Mount where he was crucified, there was but one of them who appeared to witness the death of their Master and kinsman, and the extinction of all their hopes. The event was one for which they were wholly unprepared. It confounded them. Their preconceived opinions were so strong, that when Jesus had before spoken to them of his death, they shut up their ears and their eyes; they *would not* understand him. We do not find a single hint in the Gospels, that they ever did understand him. The event itself was a blow, which at once enlightened and convinced them, and scattered them abroad also, like sheep without a shepherd. This is one scene.

'And now let us behold another, which immediately succeeds it. Not a great many days elapse, when we find these very men, disheartened, disappointed, terrified, and dispersed as they had been, all gathered together again with one accord, fully recovered from all their depression, and with a settled resolution stamped on all their demeanour, which never marked them before, even while their Master was with them, to lead, combine, and encourage them. The catalogue of their names is full, with one vacancy only, which they immediately supply. They begin to preach the doctrines of a crucified Saviour, and we hear no more of their earthly notions of his kingdom. Their crude ideas and temporal hopes, have, in a few days, vanished away. They preach Christianity, simply and purely. They gather to themselves thousands of converts. They are persecuted, imprisoned, threatened; they behold one of their number soon cut off with the sword; they are surrounded by enemies and temptations; and yet they never hesitate nor falter; no, not the weakest of them; there is not a single defection from their reunited brotherhood. They go through country after country, and toil after toil, laying down their lives, one after another, for the holy truth, and they leave disciples behind them everywhere, to teach, and dare, and suffer, and do, and die, as they did.

'Now what is the cause of all this, and how is it to be accounted for? Unbelievers may have many explanations to give, and they may be ingenious ones. I have but one, and it is a simple one. It is, that their crucified Master rose from the dead, as they have told us he did; that he instructed them, as they have told us he did; and that the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, was sent from the Father, according to his promise, to enlighten and sustain them. In short, I consider the conduct of the apostles, at, and after the death of Jesus, as perhaps the strongest proof of the reality of his glorious resurrection. If he rose from the dead, and appeared to them, and instructed and confirmed them, I can account for the sudden

change in their characters, and for their subsequent knowledge and perseverance, and boldness, and success. If he rose not from the dead, I cannot account for those things; and the whole subject remains to me a deep historical mystery.

'Simple, honest, excellent men! raised up by Providence for wonderful ends by wonderful means! Your lives, unadorned as they are, and comprehended in a few plain words, are yet alone among the lives of men; alone, in the varieties and contrasts of their fortunes; alone, in the multitude and importance of their consequences. We should be senseless, if we did not perceive the influence which you have exerted on the character and opinions of mankind. We should be thankless, if we did not acknowledge the benefits of that influence, and bless God that we live to know and feel them. And we humbly pray to God, the universal Father, the Source of all excellence and truth, that our fidelity to our common Master may be like yours; that our perseverance in executing his commands may be like yours; and that like yours may be our courage and constancy, if we should ever be called on to sacrifice comfort, worldly consideration, or life itself, to duty, conscience, and faith.' pp. 118—120.

We take our leave of Mr Greenwood, grateful for the pleasure he has afforded us, and the valuable contribution he has made to the stock of American literature. Before we part, however, we would express the hope, that he will enrich another edition of his work, which we are happy to hear is peremptorily called for, with the Lives of the evangelists, Mark and Luke, and of the apostle Paul. We assure him that it will greatly enhance the value and interest of his work.

ART. XI. *A Discourse pronounced at the Request of the Essex Historical Society, on the 18th of September, 1828, in Commemoration of the First Settlement of Salem, in the State of Massachusetts. By* JOSEPH STORY. Boston. Hilliard, Gray, Little, & Wilkins. 1828. 8vo. pp. 90.

WE have read this Discourse with pleasure, and though we do not propose to review it as a literary performance, it contains some passages which cannot be too widely circulated, and fall peculiarly within the province of this journal. These we shall set before our readers, and add a few remarks of our own, confining ourselves to what is said of the religious character of our ancestors, and particularly of their intolerance, and the remains of this vice still existing.

In considering the object they had in view, and their severe trials, and the manner in which these trials were met and sustained, the discourse eulogizes, as it should, the piety and constancy of the first colonists.

'What better origin could we desire, than from men of characters like these? Men, to whom conscience was everything, and worldly prosperity nothing. Men, whose thoughts belonged to eternity rather than to time. Men, who in the near prospect of their sacrifices, could say, as our forefathers did say, "When we are in our graves, it will be all one, whether we have lived in plenty or in penury; whether we have died in a bed of down, or locks of straw. Only this is the advantage of the mean condition, THAT IT IS A MORE FREEDOM TO DIE. And the less comfort any have in the things of this world, the more liberty they have to lay up treasure in heaven." Men, who in answer to the objection, urged by the anxiety of friendship, that they might perish by the way, or by hunger or the sword, could answer, as our forefathers did, "We may trust God's providence for these things. Either he will keep these evils from us; or will dispose them for our good, and enable us to bear them." Men, who in still later days, in their appeal for protection to the throne, could say with pathetic truth and simplicity, as our forefathers did, "that we might enjoy divine worship without human mixtures, without offence to God, man, or our own consciences, with leave, *but not without tears*, we departed from our country, kindred, and fathers' houses into this Patmos; in relation whereunto we do not say, our garments are become old by reason of the very long journey, but that ourselves, who came away in our strength, are, by reason of long absence, many of us become grey-headed, and some of us stooping for age."

'If these be not the sentiments of lofty virtue; if they breathe not the genuine spirit of Christianity; if they speak not high approaches towards moral perfection; if they possess not an enduring sublimity;—then, indeed, have I ill read the human heart; then, indeed, have I strangely mistaken the inspirations of religion. If men, like these, can be passed by with indifference, because they wore not the princely robes, or the sacred lawn, because they shone not in courts, or feasted in fashionable circles, then, indeed, is Christian glory a vain shadow, and human virtue a dream, about which we disquiet ourselves in vain.

But it is not so—it is not so. There are those around me, whose hearts beat high, and whose lips grow eloquent, when the remembrance of such ancestors comes over their thoughts; when they read in their deeds, not the empty forms, but the essence of holy living and holy dying. Time was, when the exploits of war, the heroes of many battles, the conquerors of millions, the men, who waded through slaughter to thrones, the kings, whose footsteps were darkened with blood, and the sceptred oppressors of the earth, were alone deemed worthy themes for the poet and the orator, for the song of the minstrel, and the hosannas of the multitude. Time was, when feats of arms, and tournaments, and crusades, and the high array of chivalry, and the pride of royal banners waving for victory, engrossed all minds. Time was, when the ministers of the altar sat down by the side of the tyrant, and numbered his victims, and stimulated his persecutions, and screened the instruments of his crimes—and there was praise and glory and revelry for these things. Murder, and rapine, burning cities, and desolated plains, if so be they were at the bidding of royal or baronial feuds, led on by the courtier or the clan, were matters of public boast, the delight of courts, and the treasured pleasure of the fireside tales. But these times have passed away. Christianity has resumed her meek and holy reign. The Puritans have not lived in vain. The simple piety of the Pilgrims of New England casts into shade this false glitter, which dazzled and betrayed men into the worship of their destroyers. pp. 40—42.

Still it is difficult to speak as we should of the character of our ancestors, many of whose vices were in some sense virtues, as they thought them to be virtues, and practised them at great sacrifices. It is a difficult question in morals, perhaps the most difficult, how far sincerity is an excuse for material errors affecting the conduct, and seriously and permanently injuring the disposition. To us, however, it is quite clear that if a man is really factious, vindictive, and intolerant, no matter how he may have become so, and no matter how sincerely, still he is in point of fact, and so far as these qualities go, a bad citizen, and a bad Christian. Apologists will sometimes say, that it is in the highest degree unreasonable to suppose that our fathers could have been any better than they were, considering the age and circumstances in which they lived. Perhaps this is true; but we must not infer that a defect should be excused, merely because we can account for its existence. At any rate it does not cease to be a defect. Two mistakes have betrayed men into false, though very different estimates of the character of the Puritans, according to the different prejudices with which they have approached the subject. An admirer is apt to be dazzled by the distinctness and prominency of a few virtues which they unquestionably exhibited in an uncommon degree, and deceives himself into a belief that they ought to be ranked according to their character in these respects, and not according to their character as a whole. The Cavaliers, on the other hand, affected to despise the Puritans; but, though there were many things in that remarkable people to be feared, and many things to be condemned, there was hardly anything that could be regarded, properly speaking, as an object of contempt, much less of merriment or banter. There was a fierce and determined spirit, mingled even with their fooleries and absurdities, before which the scoffer quailed.

The view which this discourse gives of the errors and vices of our forefathers, is one which the candid and judicious of all parties must approve.

'It has been said, that our forefathers were bigoted, intolerant, and persecuting; that while they demanded religious freedom for themselves, they denied it to all others; that in their eyes even error in ceremony or mode of worship was equally reprehensible with error in doctrine, and, if persisted in, deserved the temporal punishments denounced upon heresy. Mr Hume has dwelt with no small complacency upon the fact, that the Puritans "maintained that they themselves were the only pure church; that their principles and practices ought to be established by law; and that no others ought to be tolerated."

'I am not disposed to deny the truth of this charge, or to conceal, or to extenuate the facts. I stand not up here the apologist for persecution, whether it be by Catholic or Protestant, by Puritan or Prelate, by Congregationalist or Covenanter, by Church or State, by the Monarch or the Peo-

ple. Wherever, and by whomsoever, it is promulgated or supported, under whatever disguises, for whatever purposes, at all times, and under all circumstances, it is a gross violation of the rights of conscience, and utterly inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity. I care not, whether it goes to life, or property, or office, or reputation, or mere private comfort, it is equally an outrage upon religion and the unalienable rights of man. If there is any right, sacred beyond all others, because it imports everlasting consequences, it is the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences. Whoever attempts to narrow it down in any degree, to limit it by the creed of any sect, to bound the exercise of private judgment, or free inquiry, by the standard of his own faith, be he priest or layman, ruler or subject, dishonors so far the profession of Christianity, and wounds it in its vital virtues. The doctrine, on which such attempts are founded, goes to the destruction of all free institutions of government. There is not a truth to be gathered from history more certain, or more momentous, than this, that civil liberty cannot long be separated from religious liberty without danger, and ultimately without destruction to both. Wherever religious liberty exists, it will, first or last, bring in, and establish political liberty. Wherever it is suppressed, the church establishment will, first or last, become the engine of despotism, and overthrow, unless it be itself overthrown, every vestige of political right. How it is possible to imagine, that a religion breathing the spirit of mercy and benevolence, teaching the forgiveness of injuries, the exercise of charity, and the return of good for evil; how it is possible, I say, for such a religion to be so perverted, as to breathe the spirit of slaughter and persecution, of discord and vengeance for differences of opinion, is a most unaccountable and extraordinary moral phenomenon. Still more extraordinary, that it should be the doctrine, not of base and wicked men merely, seeking to cover up their own misdeeds; but of good men, seeking the way of salvation with uprightness of heart and purpose. It affords a melancholy proof of the infirmity of human judgment, and teaches a lesson of humility, from which spiritual pride may learn meekness, and spiritual zeal a moderating wisdom.

'Let us not, then, in examining the deeds of our fathers, shrink from our proper duty to ourselves. Let us not be untrue to the lights of our own days, to the religious privileges, which we enjoy, to those constitutions of government, which proclaim Christian equality to all sects, and deny the power of persecution to all. Our fathers had not arrived at the great truth, that *action*, not *opinion*, is the proper object of human legislation; that religious freedom is the birthright of man; that governments have no authority to inflict punishment for conscientious differences of opinion; and that to worship God according to our own belief is not only our privilege, but is our duty, our absolute duty, from which no human tribunal can absolve us. We should be unworthy of our fathers, if we should persist in error, when it is known to us. Their precept, like their example, speaking as it were from their sepulchres, is, to follow truth, not as they saw it, but as we see it, fearlessly and faithfully.' pp. 45—47.

The vulgar charge of inconsistency in their intolerance, often brought against the first settlers of New England, does not seem to be sustained, in its literal and obvious sense; though, of course, it will not be denied that their conduct in this respect involved them in much virtual inconsistency. Before leaving their native country they never pretended, they never thought, that they were

contending and suffering for religious liberty, as that word is now understood by philosophical reasoners, or even for an unlimited toleration. Passages do occasionally occur in their writings, which breathe a free spirit; but they never intended them to be understood to the full extent of advocating entire religious liberty, and most of them would probably have been offended and shocked by such a proposal almost as much as a Gardiner, or a Laud. The only inconsistency fairly proved on our ancestors, is, the common one of adopting great and leading principles, long before many of their legitimate consequences were known or even suspected, and therefore without being true to these principles in all their applications. Practically speaking, the only liberty for which our fathers contended, or understood themselves to be contending, was the liberty of worshipping God according to their own interpretation of the gospel; and this liberty they had purchased at too dear a price to allow it to be endangered by the fanaticism of the Quakers, or the insidious encroachments of Episcopacy. These remarks go no farther than to relieve them in some degree from the imputation of inconsistency; but if they were not inconsistent, it only shows that on this subject their principles and their conduct were equally bad.

'The truth of history compels us to admit, that from the first settlement down to the charter of William and Mary in 1692, in proportion as they gathered internal power, they were less and less disposed to share it with any other Christian sect. That charter contained an express provision, that there should be "a liberty of conscience allowed in the worship of God, to all Christians, *except Papists*." Objectionable as this clause would have been under other circumstances, the recent attempts of James the Second, to introduce Popery, and the dread which they entertained of being themselves the subjects of political, as well as religious persecution, reconciled them to it, and they hailed it almost as another *magna charta* of liberty. So true it is, that accident or interest frequently forces men to the adoption of correct principles, when a sense of justice has totally failed to effect it. In the intermediate period, the Quakers and Anabaptists, and in short all other Dissenters from their creed, had been unrelentingly persecuted by fine, imprisonment, banishment, and sometimes even by death itself. Episcopalians, too, fell under their special displeasure; and notwithstanding every effort of the Crown, by threats and remonstrance, they studiously excluded them from every office, and even from the right of suffrage. No person but a freeman was permitted to vote in any public affairs, or to hold any office; and no person could become a freeman but by being a member of their own church, and recommended by their own clergy. In truth the clergy possessed a power and influence in the state, as great as ever was exercised under any church establishment whatsoever. There was not, until after the repeal of the first charter in 1676, a single Episcopal society in the whole colony; and even the celebration of Christmas was punished as a public offence. In this exclusive policy our ancestors obstinately persevered, against every remonstrance at home and abroad. When Sir Richard Saltonstall wrote to them his admirable letter, which pleads with such a catholic enthusiasm for toleration, the harsh and brief

reply was, "God forbid our love for the truth should be grown so cold, that we should tolerate errors." And Cotton himself, "whose praise is in all our churches," the man, who could with a noble independence address himself to the bishop of Lincoln, in language like this; "However much I do highly prize, and much prefer other men's judgment, and learning, and wisdom, and piety; yet in things pertaining to God, and his worship, *still I must* (as I ought) *live by my own faith, not theirs;*" such a man, I say, could meanly stoop in the defence of persecution to arguments not unworthy of the worst ages of bigotry. They went farther, imitating in this respect the famous act of uniformity of Elizabeth, and compelled an attendance upon their own mode of worship under a penalty. Yes, the very men did this, who thought paying one shilling for not coming to prayers in England, was an unsupportable tyranny. Yes, the very men who asked from Charles the Second, after his restoration, liberty of conscience and worship for themselves, were deaf, and dumb, and blind, when it was demanded by his commissioners for Episcopalians and others. They silently evaded the claim, or resolutely refused it, as the temper of the times enabled them to act.

The very efforts made in the colony to establish this uniformity of faith, afford striking proof of the utter hopelessness, as well as injustice of such attempts. Within ten years after their first landing, the whole colony was thrown into confusion by religious dissensions, by controversies about faith and about forms of church government; about the covenant of grace, and the covenant of works; about liberty of conscience, and exclusiveness of worship; about doctrines so mysterious and subtle, as seem past all human comprehension, and customs so trifling and vain, as seem beyond the reach of ecclesiastical censure. Who could imagine, that the reveries of Mrs Hutchinson, and the question, whether ladies should wear veils, and the legality of bearing the cross in a military standard, should have shaken the colony to its foundations? So thickly sown were the seeds of spiritual discord, that more than *four-score* opinions were pronounced heresies by an ecclesiastical Synod convened in 1637. Yet were the difficulties far from being removed, although fines and imprisonment and banishment followed in the train of the excommunications of the church. The struggle for toleration was still maintained; the discontent with the laws, which confined political privileges to church members, constantly increased; and diversities of faith at last grew up, so numerous and so formidable, that persecution became less frequent because it was less safe. The single fact, that under this exclusive system, not more than one sixth of the qualified inhabitants were freemen in 1676, affords an ample commentary upon its injustice and folly. Five sixths of the colony were disfranchised by the influence of the ecclesiastical power.' pp. 51—55.

Our wonder at the slow progress of correct opinions on this subject, will be lessened, if we consider how many there are who will not think, how many there are who dare not think, and how many there are who cannot think. The politician trembles for his popularity, the priest trembles for his benefice, and the miserable tools and dupes of both, tremble because they are told to tremble. Then there is the timid, well meaning believer, who thinks that error itself is better than the skepticism which free inquiry would be likely to induce; and the misguided philanthropist and peace-maker who thinks anything better than controversy. Many of them are yet to learn from Lord

Bacon, that 'a froward retention of custom is as *turbulent* a thing as an innovation.' It was natural to suppose that infidels would favor religious liberty, but they have commonly been found among its most determined foes; partly because they were unwilling to hazard their influence on a subject about which they felt so little interest, partly because they could not see any benefit in changing one error for another, and partly because they wished to use the long established superstitions of the country for political purposes. Not to mention the infidels among the Catholics, some of whom have worn the triple crown, it is enough to say that many of the celebrated English infidels were Tories and High-Churchmen.

'I am aware, that in the writings of some of the early reformers, there may be found here and there passages, which recognise the principles of religious liberty. But we must remember, that they were uttered in the heat of controversy, to beat down the authority of the Romish church; and so little were they sustained by public opinion, that they were lamentably forgotten in the first moments of Protestant victory. They were mere outworks in the system of theological opinions, which might form a defence against Catholic attacks; and were treated with contempt or indifference, when heresies sprung up in the bosom of the new faith. My Lord Bacon, in his discourse upon the unity of religion, written with a moderation becoming his great mind, and with a spirit of indulgence far beyond the age, has nevertheless contended strenuously for the unity of faith, and declared, that "heresies and schisms are of all others the greatest scandals." At the same time he boldly warns us not "to propagate religion by wars, or by sanguinary persecutions to force consciences." At the distance of a century, the enlightened author of the "Spirit of Laws," avowed the doctrine, that it is sound policy, when the state is already satisfied with the established religion, not to suffer the establishment of another. And while he declares that penal laws, in respect to religion, ought to be avoided, he paradoxically maintains the doctrine, as a fundamental principle, that when the state is at liberty to receive or reject a new religion, it ought to be rejected; when it is received, it ought to be tolerated. So slowly does truth make its way even among the most gifted minds, in opposition to preconceived opinions and prejudices.

'Nay, we need not go back to other times for illustrative examples. Is it even now true, that the doctrine of religious liberty is received with entire approbation in Christendom? Where it is received with most favor, is it not recognised more as matter of toleration and policy, than of right? suffered rather than supported? connived at from fear, rather than vindicated upon principle? Even in England, free and enlightened as she is, how slow and reluctant has been the progress towards a generous toleration. It is scarcely twelve years since it ceased to be a crime punishable with fine and imprisonment, to deny the doctrine of the Trinity. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge are still by their statutes closed against the admission of Dissenters from the established church. For more than a century and a half, Protestant Dissenters of every description were excluded by law from the possession of offices of trust or profit in the kingdom. The repeal of the odious corporation and test acts, by which this exclusion was guarded, was, after much resist-

ance, accomplished only at the last session of parliament; and the celebrations of this event, of this emancipation from religious thraldom of *one third* of her whole population, are just reaching our ears from the other side of the Atlantic. The Catholic yet groans under the weight of disabilities imposed upon him by the unrelenting arm of power, and sickens at the annual visitation of that hope of relief, which mocks him at every approach, and recedes at the very moment, when it seems within his grasp. Even in our own country, can we lay our hands upon our hearts, and say with sincerity, that this universal freedom of religion is watched by none with jealousy and discontent? that there are none, who would employ the civil arm to suppress heresy, or to crush the weaker sects?' pp. 49—51.

Hume gives the substance of a speech, which Lord Herbert puts into the mouth of a member of parliament in the reign of Henry VIII., of a highly liberal, and even of a latitudinarian cast; in which the speaker argues, just like a modern Deist, 'that the only religion obligatory on mankind is the belief of one Supreme Being, the author of nature, and the necessity of good morals in order to obtain his favor and protection.' It is not a little strange, as Hallam observes, that Hume should have adduced this speech as an original document, not seeming to suspect that it was a mere fancy sketch of the historian, giving indeed his own sentiments, but such as would hardly have found a place in the public deliberations of an age so bigoted and superstitious as that to which they are referred. The Chancellor de l'Hôspital, under Francis II. of France, is entitled, we think, to the proud distinction of being the first statesman who seriously endeavoured to infuse into a government, just notions of the true policy in regard to religious differences. From the Reformation downward, and notwithstanding a few temporary but atrocious acts of power, like the Bartholomew massacre and the *dragonâde* of Louis XIV., we believe it will be found that the Protestants under the Catholic government of France, have enjoyed a more perfect toleration than the Catholics under the Protestant government of England. The English probably owe more of their civil liberty to the Presbyterians than to the Independents, and particularly to the Long Parliament while the former had the ascendency. In religious matters, however, none of this sect seem to have approached any nearer the true doctrine of liberty than the celebrated Lightfoot, who 'would not go about to determine whether *conscience* might be bound or not, yet certainly the *devil in the conscience* might be, yea, must be bound by the civil magistrate.'

It is often said, after Hume and other writers on the subject, that the Independents were the first, who, as a party, in power as well as out of it, always adhered to the principles of toleration. But this praise can only be bestowed with material qualifications. For, while the government was in their hands, the persecution of

the Catholics and Unitarians was never intermitted for an hour; and humanity was outraged by the barbarities committed on Naylor, and other fanatics, under the forms of law. Almost the only credit due to Cromwell in this connexion, regards the masterly manner in which he managed and restrained the leading sectaries. Selden had taught him that if he would have peace in the Commonwealth, he must begin by chaining up the clergy on both sides; and this he did—at least he obtained an entire ascendency over them, sometimes by chiming in with their extravagances, sometimes by playing off one against another, and sometimes by the sudden and stern interposition of the civil arm. He does not appear to have inclined at all to the doctrine afterwards maintained by Leslie, the Non-juror, who thought that laymen ought not to be allowed to choose their own chaplains, and objected also to the phrase, 'my chaplain,' as if they were servants. 'Otherwise,' says he, 'the expression is proper enough to say, my chaplain, as I say my parish priest, my bishop, my king, or my God; which argues my being under their care and direction, and that I belong to them, not they to me.' It is this blind and cowardly succumbing to the priesthood, which in all ages, and in all countries, has been the principal obstacle to the progress of liberty. After all, however, there is no class of men to whom religious liberty is so much indebted, or who have done so much to establish it on a right foundation, and propagate its spirit, as the distinguished writers in what has been called the latitudinarian school in the Anglican church; Chillingworth, Jeremy Taylor, Locke, Hoadly, Paley; names with which is associated almost everything dear to genius, learning, freedom, and piety. It is, and it ever must be, a standing reproach to the early Congregationalists of Massachusetts, founded as their churches were on a perfect democracy, and independent of one another, that they should yet fall so far behind the Baptist colony of Rhode Island, and the Quaker colony of Pennsylvania, and the Catholic colony of Maryland, in the recognition of that liberty, without which all other liberty is but a name—liberty of conscience, freedom of mind. Heartily, therefore, most heartily do we concur in the eloquent strain in which the writer of this discourse concludes his remarks on this ungrateful topic.

'While, then, we joyfully celebrate this anniversary, let us remember, that our forefathers had their faults, as well as virtues; that their example is not always a safe pattern for our imitation, but sometimes a beacon of solemn warning. Let us do, not what they did, but what with our lights and advantages they would have done, must have done, from the love of country, and the love of truth. Is there any one, who would now for a moment justify the exclusion of every person from political rights and privileges, who is not a Congregationalist of the straitest sect in doctrine and discipline? Is there any one, who would exclude the Episcopalian, the Baptist, the Methodist, the Quaker, or the Universalist, not

merely from power and Christian fellowship, but from breathing the same air, and enjoying the same sunshine, and reaping the same harvest because he walks not in the same faith, and kneels not at the same altar, with himself? Is there any one, who would bring back the by-gone penalties, and goad on tender consciences to hypocrisy or self-destruction? Is there any one, that would light the faggot to burn the innocent? that would stain the temples of God with the blood of martyrdom? that would cut off all the charities of human life, and in a religious warfare, arm the father aginst the son, the mother against the daughter, the wife against the husband? that would bind all posterity in the fetters of his own creed, and shipwreck their consciences? If any such there be, whatever badge they may wear, they are enemies to us and our institutions. They would sap the foundations of our civil as well as religious liberties. They would betray us into worse than Egyptian bondage. Of the doctrines of such men, if any such there be, I would say with the earnestness of the apostolical exhortation, "Touch not, taste not, handle not." If ever there could be a case, in which intolerance would rise almost into the dignity of a virtue, it would be, when its object was to put down intolerance. No—let us cling with a holy zeal to the Bible, and the Bible only, as the religion of Protestants. Let us proclaim with Milton, that "neither traditions, nor councils, nor canons of any visible church, much less edicts of any civil magistrate, or civil session, but the Scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and *that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself.*" Let us inscribe on the walls of our dwellinghouses, in our temples, in our halls of legislation, in our courts of justice, the admirable declaration of Queen Mary, the consort of William the Third, than which a nobler precept of wisdom never fell from uninspired lips—"It is not in the power of men to believe what they please; and therefore, they should not be forced in matters of religion contrary to their persuasions and their consciences." ' pp. 57—59.

Other subjects are also discussed in this discourse with the eloquence, ability, and discrimination which every one would expect; particularly the institution of free schools, the treatment of the Aborigines, and the Salem witchcraft. It is, however, as we have intimated before, for its powerful advocacy of the great cause of religious liberty, that we have noticed it in this journal; and our limits permit us to do no more. The times demand that every man of influence, of whatever station, should raise his voice against an Exclusive system in the church, which unhappily has enlisted in its service almost everything that was bad in the spirit of the Pilgrims, with scarce the admixture of a single particle of their real and great excellences. Do they mean to give the guidance of public opinion on the most interesting of subjects, and on the subject which moves the strongest passions, into the hands of men whose inexperience, or intemperate zeal, or unprincipled ambition utterly unfits them for the trust? Do they not know that the prejudices and superstitions of the multitude may be wrought upon until all the restraints of reason and good government will be lost in the worst form of radicalism? Well disposed persons who are fond of popularity, will sometimes throw themselves on the current, in the

hope that, by seeming to yield to it, they may in a little while be able to direct and control it by their superior address and management; but they have yet to learn that there is a cunning among religionists which passes the cunning of this world, and a lust of power more active and vigilant, and equally unscrupulous. The heated and perplexed politician may also be sometimes tempted to appeal to the prejudices of the Exclusive party, and court their alliance. We doubt, however, whether there is a single instance on record of an ambitious man who resorted to a religious faction for aid under hollow pretences, and from worldly considerations solely, who did not afterwards find, to his infinite mortification, that he had all the time been a mere instrument and puppet in the hands of the men he despised. The men who are really to influence and rule a violent religious faction, are men like Mahomet or Cromwell, who were reared in its bosom, and, at least in some period of their lives, have been themselves the subjects of the same delusion.

Again we say, the times demand that men of eminence, and public men, should raise their voices against the first and slightest encroachments on the glorious liberty of the children of God—that liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and which is recognised and guaranteed in the most solemn manner in the Constitution. By such a course a man does not make himself a partisan; on the contrary he shows that he is not a partisan in the common and bad sense; for he is seen holding the golden scales of perfect justice and equality over all parties. Let the people of New England remember the indignant remonstrance of William Blackstone, the first settler of Boston, that he did not, at sacrifices dearer far than life, fly from the tyranny of Lords Bishops, merely that he might pass under the yoke of Lords Brethren. Should the dominant sect in the church ever dare to assume in effect, no matter under what pretences, the least particle of influence or authority in the state, merely on account of their supposed Orthodoxy, the blood of our fathers, notwithstanding their many inconsistences, will cry to us from the ground for resistance—resistance unto death, and we shall prove recreant to the name and race, if it cries in vain.

Art. XII.—1. *Original Moral Tales, intended for Children and Young Persons.* 8 Vols. 18mo. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828.

2. *The Juvenile Miscellany.* 6 Vols. 12mo. Boston. Putnam & Hunt. 1826–8.

3. *The Mirror; or, Eighteen Juvenile Tales and Dialogues.* By a Lady of Philadelphia. 18mo. pp. 288. Boston. Munroe & Francis, and Charles S. Francis, New York.

An earnest devotion to the cause of education is one of the most honorable distinctions of the present age. The efforts which have been made to extend the benefits of cultivation to the lower classes, and to make instruction more effectual, have been great and unremitted; and there is reason to believe that a real improvement in the modes of teaching and the character of elementary treatises, has been effected. It is not, however, our present intention to enter into an examination of what has been done by the efforts to promote education, but to call the attention of our readers to what seems to us a serious evil that has grown out of the prevalent desire of improving children; we mean, the character and enormous quantity of the books manufactured and published for their amusement.

Formerly children were amused by fables, fairy tales, and ghost stories, spells, spirits, and enchantments. It seemed to be thought that the strong excitement of something supernatural, and which could not be found in this every day world, was necessary to rouse their latent imaginations, and to teach them virtues to which their natures were averse. By degrees the world grew wiser, and it was found that children could be deeply interested in accounts of other children little different from themselves, and now it seems to be very well ascertained, that to amuse children is a very easy task,—indeed, that they will attend to anything in the shape of a story.

Many persons, who consider children themselves as the best judges of works intended for them, have taken it for granted that all the little stories, which the press is daily pouring forth, are good, merely because boys and girls read them with avidity. We have heard good intentioned and even sensible people say, 'How many books there are for children, and all so good!' Now, though we freely admit that many of these works are much better than most of those published thirty or forty years ago, we fear that a great number of them are open to very serious objections.

The subject is of more importance than it may appear at first sight. This is a reading community; and the sentiments and principles of many children are formed almost as much by read-

ing, as by intercourse with the world. To a man or woman, the injury done by reading a few silly, or even immoral books, is comparatively small. The impression is generally soon effaced by the employments of life and intercourse with society, even if the reader is not able to estimate very nicely the respective merits of the works which he reads, and to follow the best guides. Still, the injury to females, which was produced by the weak novels and romances, which were current twenty or thirty years ago, was very serious and alarming. How much more dangerous, then, are the little novels which are written for young children. Impressions are easily made at an early age, which are hard to be obliterated in maturer years. Everything which is read in childhood forms a moral lesson; and the little heroes and heroines of these stories become at once models for the imitation of the boys and girls who read them. It seems to us, therefore, that the romantic and sentimental character of some of these stories is very objectionable. The tendency of this sort of writing, is obviously, as it is in similar works for grown people, to enervate the mind, to produce a morbid sensibility, and unfit children for the dull duties of real life, and make them act too much for stage effect. They learn false and exaggerated feelings, displays of sentiment, affectation, and the refinements of selfishness. Their views of life become discolored and distorted. The mind loses its healthy and vigorous action. A strong and perpetual excitement from the same poison which they have once drunk, becomes necessary to their existence. The full effects which might be apprehended from these pernicious influences, are fortunately in most instances prevented by other more powerful influences. Still, the tendency of this sort of reading is so certain in all cases, and in some its effects are so bad, that the subject deserves a thorough consideration. As specimens of the sentimental sort of writing to which we have adverted, we refer our readers to 'Isabella, or Filial Affection,' and the 'Lace Workers' and the 'Roses' in the Juvenile Miscellany, and the 'Two Portraits' in the Casket.

Let us not however be misunderstood. We are not enemies to all romantic incidents indiscriminately, though we think they should be introduced sparingly, as they occur seldom in real life. They should never go beyond the limits of probability, and they should be of such a character, as not to excite in the young reader false views of the stage on which he is soon to act. And with regard to sentiment, we only object to extravagant and violent feelings, not justified by the occasions producing them, and an ostentatious parade of natural affections. We are not unwilling, but certainly desirous, that the virtues presented for imitation should be pure and refined.

It is very obvious, that whatever else is the object of a book of

amusement for the young, it ought to inculcate good morality; not an accommodating, worldly morality, but the pure and strict morality of Christianity. This perhaps seems almost a truism. Yet if we examine by this rule, the little tales which are current among us, we shall find that few of them will stand the test. A very nice moral judgment, indeed, could not be expected from all the numerous authors who are pursuing the path of juvenile literature; for many of them must be both injudicious and ignorant. And even where the writers may be supposed to be more capable of forming a correct estimate of the moral lessons of their pieces, we often find them inadvertently giving currency to the most incorrect principles. The following story, taken from a work which has been highly commended, and is in many respects worthy of approbation, affords a striking example of this fault.

'INGENIOUS REPLY.—Mr John Horne Tooke, an Englishman very celebrated for his talents and acquirements, was the son of an honest man who sold poultry in London. While at Westminster and Eton schools, he associated with boys of high rank, and having a childish fear that they would laugh at his father's business, he resolved to save himself all ridicule by his wit, without telling an express falsehood. One day a circle of idle boys stood round him, questioning each other upon the respective rank and condition of their parents. One said he was the son of Sir Robert A——; the next, that his father was Earl of B——; and a third, that his grandmother was Duchess of C——; when it came to John Horne's turn, he observed "that he could not boast of any titles in his family;" and on being more closely pressed, he added, "that his father was an eminent Turkey merchant." This was strictly true; but the boys supposed his father to be one of the wealthy merchants, who, at that time, carried on an extensive trade with Turkey,—while in reality he was only a seller of turkeys.'*

It requires no very scrupulous moral sense to perceive, that here is a direct lesson in the art of lying; and yet it is sent out to the world, as an example worthy of imitation. Though the words of Tooke were '*strictly true*,' the sort of truth which they possess, is no more creditable than '*express falsehood*.' Again;—

'*Sally.* Oh, Madam, it is Molly that is wrong; she wishes to read a letter which is not her own. *Mrs Teachum.* To whom is it addressed? *Sally.* To Cecilia, Madam. *Mrs Teachum.* Molly, give it to me. You certainly would not have read it! Go and rejoin your companions.—*Mrs Teachum, (alone.)* Let me see this letter, which chance has thrown into my hands. It is my duty to establish my favorable idea of Cecilia. It is not the hand of my lady; who can it be from? (*She reads.*)' †

What lesson is to be drawn from this passage, except that the same code of morals which is enforced on the young, is not binding on grown people?

* Juvenile Miscellany, Jan. 1828, vol. iii. pp. 327. † The Casket, pp. 87, 88.

We suppose that Æsop's Fables are quite exploded now, or we should enter a protest against them. Their great object appears to be to show the superior value of craft and cunning to open dealing and honesty. We can still remember the indignation which we used to feel at the triumph of the fox in imposing on the simple-hearted kindness of the goat. It is indeed astonishing that these fables, however fanciful and ingenious, should have ever been thought suitable for children. They do, perhaps, teach a sort of morality, but, as has been well remarked, it is the morality of a slave.

Mothers cannot be too cautious in selecting the books with which they furnish their children. Under the name of amusement, they may be unwittingly administering poison. Stories which have become popular, are generally put into the hands of children, with little or no attempt on the part of parents to judge of the quality of their contents. When any examination is made, it is usually very hasty and superficial. If the general design and moral tendency of the work seem good, almost every body is satisfied, though it is manifest that its general good tendency is perfectly consistent with great moral errors in different parts. And here is the great danger. The writers of these tales have generally a good design, and are capable of judging of the moral lesson which it is their main object to teach; but yet from haste, ignorance, narrow views, or some of the other numberless sources of error, will suffer incidents and sentiments of the most pernicious character to escape them.

We had thought it to be an admitted axiom in education that no sort of lying or deception should be practised towards children. Where a system of deception is habitually carried on in managing a child, he seldom fails to discover it sooner or later, and when once discovered, he loses entirely his respect for his guardian, and too often abandons that sincere love of truth which he sees is disregarded by those who ought to be wiser than himself. Stories in which this manœuvring is exhibited without any marks of disapprobation, must have a very unfavorable influence on the character of both parents and children. They teach parents to practise a system of fraud, and children to suspect and elude it. They unsettle the first principles of right and wrong, destroy the graceful simplicity of youth, and supply its place by artful management. We are happy to acknowledge that in this, as in all other respects, there has been a general improvement in children's books during the present century. Still we are afraid that the reform is not so complete as is desirable. In one instance before us, a little girl and boy are represented as having come home wet and dirty, in consequence of visiting a family of rude

children, contrary to the advice of their mother. The mother is made to say to the maid—'Undress them as quickly as possible, and put them to bed. Be sure you give them no supper, for, as they have doubtless taken cold, eating may occasion a fever. I expect to be compelled to send for Dr R—— tomorrow.'* The next day the doctor is sent for, 'more to impress them with the folly of their conduct, than for any real necessity for his advice.' The doctor enters into the mother's scheme for frightening the children, and, after writing a recipe, leaves them 'with a serious and lengthened visage.' It may perhaps be said that the children were really sick, and needed the physician and the physic. But this is not clear from the story; and the impression left on our own minds, and which we think would be left on a child's, is, that the loss of supper, the threat of the fever, the doctor, and the medicine, are all parts of a farce acted to terrify the little offenders.

In tales that are directed against any particular fault, what is represented as its punishment, ought to be, if not a necessary, yet at least a common consequence of it. If this rule be neglected the story becomes almost worthless as an example. A mere misfortune accidentally occurring after a piece of misconduct with which it is not usually connected, cannot properly be considered as a punishment, unless it be looked on as a judgment by a special interposition of Providence. The reader must know that there is no reason to believe that the same accident will happen to himself, or else he must learn false views of life. But, in many stories, any accident which follows soon after an error, is represented as its punishment. To see that this course is incorrect, it is only necessary to consider what are the natural punishments of the faults of children. This, of course, depends in a great measure on the character of the faults. Bad habits, such as indolence, ill temper, lying, &c., are frequently punished directly, by those who have the care of children. As this is common, there is, perhaps, no objection to such representations in books. Children are often punished indirectly by disgrace and mortification, and by the alienation of affection which their faults produce in friends and companions; and they often suffer from the reproaches of their own consciences. There are also certain evils which flow from particular offences, which may therefore be considered as their most appropriate punishments. The natural consequence of lying in a boy, is, that his word is disregarded; of ill temper, that he is feared and shunned by his playmates; of carelessness, that he meets with accidents and misfortunes; of idleness, that he becomes listless and unhappy, and so on.

But many of the works under consideration show no perception

* The Obstinate Children, p. 23.

of the connexion between cause and effect. Thus, when we find that a little boy who did not love his books, burns himself by his carelessness in using a lamp in a room where there are shavings, no reader can perceive any connexion between the dislike to literature and the burning.* Any boy who *did* love his books, might meet with the same accident, if he were equally careless. The lesson is a good one against carelessness, but not against neglect of books. In another story, a little girl is cured of inquisitiveness, vanity, selfishness, and wilfulness, in consequence of breaking her leg in attempting to reach from a high shelf, something which she had been forbidden to touch. It might well happen that the individual experiencing so severe an injury, would be cured; but as no reader would expect to break a leg because he had the same faults, we cannot conceive that he would learn anything from it, except perhaps to be more careful when he had anything to reach from a high shelf.†

The subject of rewards is as important as that of punishments. It seems to us that the mode in which they are represented as bestowed in many little books, is not such as to produce the most salutary impression. It is an error to represent every instance of good conduct, as certainly followed by some gift, or other advantage not a consequence of the act itself. The young ought not to be taught to expect payment in cash for every praiseworthy action. It gives them false views of life; for in this world they will not meet with that poetical justice, or rather generosity, which they find in stories; and it leads them besides to act from low and unworthy motives. Half the merit of generosity, sincerity, or fortitude is taken away, if the little boy expects that he will have a reward for every instance in which he exercises those virtues. We have lately read a story,‡ which, with the exception of some faults of style, we were rather pleased with, till we got to the end, when we were sadly disappointed. The sympathy of the reader is kept up for the hero, who is represented, after some failures, as having successfully resisted several temptations, and practised much selfdenial. The approbation of his own conscience, and of his friends, ought to be felt by the reader as a sufficient encouragement to virtue, and would be so, if the effect were not weakened by the story's winding up with the reward of a journey to Niagara. Would not the moral be better, and the impression more powerful, if the reader's mind were allowed to rest satisfied with the admiration of the virtue itself, and the reward which he must feel it in his own power to obtain by pursuing the same conduct? Would a child be taught generosity by

* George Mills, or the Little Boy who did not love his Books.
† Little Girl Taught by Experience.
‡ Temptation, or Henry Moreland.

reading a story of a boy who was rewarded by the gift of a rabbit for giving the largest apple to his little brother;* or of a girl who received the present of a 'whole basketful of fine queen cakes,' because she had carried home a cake that had before been given her, in order to share it with her little sister?†

Miss Edgeworth objects to bestowing rewards in real life, and the objection against exhibiting them in books is nearly as strong. 'Would you,' she says, 'encourage benevolence, generosity, or prudence, let each have its appropriate reward of affection, esteem, and confidence; but do not by ill judged bounties attempt to force these virtues into premature display. The rewards which are given to benevolence and generosity in children, frequently encourage selfishness, and sometimes teach them cunning. Lord Kames tells us a story, which is precisely a case in point. Two boys, the sons of the Earl of Elgin, were permitted by their father to associate with the poor boys in the neighbourhood of their father's house. One day, the earl's sons being called to dinner, a lad who was playing with them, said he would wait until they returned. "There is no dinner for me at home," said the poor boy. "Come with us, then," said the earl's sons. The boy refused, and when they asked him if he had any money to buy a dinner, he answered, "No." "Papa," said the eldest of the young gentlemen when he got home, "what was the price of the silver buckles you gave me?" "Five shillings." "Let me have the money, and I'll give you the buckles." It was done accordingly, says Lord Kames. The earl inquiring privately, found that the money was given to the lad *who had no dinner*. The buckles were returned, and the boy was highly commended for being kind to his companion. The commendations were just, but the buckles should not have been returned; the boy should have been suffered steadily to abide by his own bargain; he should have been left to feel the pleasure, and pay the exact price of his own generosity.'‡

If it be inexpedient always to represent virtue as receiving rewards, we think it still more so to deal forth presents, or even extravagant commendations to children, for performing their common and ordinary duties. It is better to relate the performance of these duties as matters of course, without remark. Yet we often find in these books the most trifling acts of good conduct receiving such praises as would only be proper for high and heroic virtue. We trust that we shall not be thought cynical for saying, that we think even the smiles of approbation on the lips of parents, are made much too common in stories. Is it not better that children should be taught to act from a sense of duty, and not always be looking for commendation to the faces of their friends,

* Four Apples. † Stories for Emma, p. 59. ‡ Practical Education, vol. i. p. 231.

where the children who most need instruction are often least likely to receive it? Even the young should be taught that virtue is to be loved for its own sake. Let us, however, not be misunderstood. We do not mean that in real life parents should be parsimonious in bestowing these tokens of commendation, but merely that they should not be so much dwelt upon in books, and put forth as powerful motives for good conduct.

As it is not easy to say in what manner it is proper to make fictitious narratives for the young, a medium for religious instruction, we feel some hesitation in pointing out what seem to us dangerous mistakes in the mode of introducing this subject, which is sometimes adopted. The aim of many writers is most praiseworthy, to impress on the minds of the young the practical tendency of the great truths of religion, to show how intimately religion should be connected with their common occupations and enjoyments, and to give them pleasing and cheerful associations with their thoughts of their Heavenly Parent. To do all this properly, requires a degree of judgment and experience proportioned to the importance of the subject; and we are afraid that the most sacred subjects are introduced in some of these volumes, in too light and familiar a manner to make any serious impression. Must not the frequent repetition of religious language have an injurious effect on the minds of children, when it is introduced so inappropriately, and with so little force, as to produce no distinct idea, no feeling of the sacredness and importance of the subject? The words become mere words of course, and when this is the case, the oftener they are repeated, the less, probably, will they be attended to. These remarks seem to us to apply, with more or less force, to a large part of the recent stories for children. But some of them are more objectionable than others; and we have, in some instances, been shocked by the irreverence with which religion is treated,—irreverence it certainly appears, though the pure intentions of the writer cannot be doubted. What mother would think of telling a child the whimsical mistakes which another child has made in his first ideas of the Deity? Yet such mistakes are actually related at length in a story written expressly for young children, and in language that we should not be willing to quote.* Indeed, we think that most of the stories by the author of this tale, exhibit a similar want of judgment in treating religious subjects. The 'Black Velvet Bracelet,' though the story and sentiments are, in many respects, good, appears to us liable to the same sort of objection. Is there not an impropriety in placing such words as '*God sees me always*,' on an ornament for a little girl, to be worn in constant view, and read at all times, by all her companions whether religious or irreligious?

* Little Emery's Sunday Lesson.

This light and familiar mention of the Deity, is quite common in many stories. It has been said that the Jews never ventured to pronounce the name of the Deity, and that Sir Robert Boyle never uttered it without a pause and evident stop in his discourse. Yet this name is continually repeated by the mother and her child, in the stories just referred to, as familiarly as they would have spoken of his schoolmates or playthings.

From faults in morals and religion, we pass to more venial errors. 'Goldsmith,' we are told by Boswell, 'said, that he thought he could write a good fable, mentioned the simplicity which that kind of composition requires, and observed, that in most fables the animals introduced seldom talk in character. "For instance," said he, "the fable of the little fishes, who saw birds fly over their heads, and, envying them, petitioned Jupiter to be changed into birds. The skill consists in making them talk like little fishes." While he was indulging himself in this fanciful reverie he observed Johnson shaking his sides and laughing. Upon which he smartly proceeded, "Why, Dr Johnson, this is not so easy as you seem to think; for if you were to make the little fishes talk, they would talk like whales."'* Goldsmith, in this remark, has hit what is one of the most common, though not the most dangerous faults, in juvenile literature. All the little fishes are too apt, not only to talk, but to reason and act like whales. It may be thought that a merely incorrect representation of life and manners cannot be dangerous to children. But the farther any representation deviates from nature, the less useful is it as an example. It is not easy for young people to apply to their own conduct, the lessons which are to be learnt from stories in which the characters introduced appear to be of a different species from themselves. Though their instructer may inform them that the lesson is meant for them, they cannot feel it to be so. The little heroes and heroines do not act from the same motives; they do not feel, and they do not think, like children. The most accurate representations of the language and feelings of youth are therefore the best.

Another fault in many recent stories, is, that there seems to be a disposition to praise, and dwell too much on the artless simplicity and natural graces of childhood. The tendency of all this, we fear, is, to produce in young readers, not the simplicity and natural manners which are admired, but an artificial imitation of them, the most disagreeable sort of affectation. The following are a few specimens of this fault.

'Maria had a sweet voice; and while Walter was making hemlock brooms for his mother, and Susan was washing the cups, she used to sit

* Boswell's Johnson, vol. ii. p. 316. London Ed. 1821.

on the door steps, singing as blithely as a robin, and keeping time with her fast moving knittingneedles.

'One day, while they were thus employed, a tall, pale looking stranger, who was passing, stopped to speak to the little musician. Her cheek was very white, and her light blue eye sunk so modestly, when any one looked at her, that the gentleman was quite enchanted.' *

This seems to us a lesson, not of modesty, but affectation.

'The next day Mrs Meredith went as she had promised, to see the little orphan girl. The old lady had just washed her, and dressed her clean, and her little curls, still glistening with the water, clustered beautifully around her forehead. She was playing with her little grey kitten, when Mrs Meredith entered, and she looked up with such bright, sunshiny blue eyes, that the good lady loved her instantly. She took her up in her lap, and kissed her sweet little lips, and told her she knew she was a good-natured little girl, because she looked so quiet and so happy.' †

'O, what a sight was there! The boy, radiant in beauty, his fine hair blown back from his noble forehead, and a bright smile lighting up his cherub features, sat in an attitude exquisitely graceful, with one arm thrown over a projection in the rock, viewing with delight the boundless prospect before him. He was so rapt, and was sending his gaze so far above and beyond the agitated spectators, that he did not see them. One breathless moment they gazed upon the bright vision, &c.' ‡

The faults of these passages have probably arisen in part from their authors aiming to give picturesque, striking, and natural descriptions. Writers seem to think, and readers too, sometimes, that if a description be natural, it is enough. Older persons are often pleased with juvenile books because they contain lively or natural pictures, and therefore recommend them. In this manner many stories get into vogue which are very ill suited for the young readers for whom they are designed. The little grey kitten, glistening curls, and sunshiny blue eyes, make a pretty picture with which parents are delighted. They therefore place the book in the hands of their children, without considering that it is not advisable that they should be taught to look up with sunshiny eyes, or to play with their kittens, for the sake of exciting admiration.

The fidelity and beauty of descriptions, even when they are not liable to the sort of objections we have mentioned, are not the highest merits in a child's book. We doubt if children, especially in early years, enjoy anything very much, merely because it is a natural picture. They have not sufficient acquaintance with life and manners, to be able to judge with critical accuracy of the fidelity of a picture to nature. We have said before that the representations in children's books should be true to nature. What we would now say does not contradict it. The feelings, motives, characters, and situations represented, should be such as children

* Juvenile Souvenir, pp. 127, 128. † Ibid., p. 87. ‡ The Casket, pp. 173, 174.

can understand and sympathize with; otherwise no lesson can be conveyed. Nothing should be unnatural. But the fidelity of the representation is important, chiefly as it is the means of making the lesson impressive.

In the following passage Miss Edgeworth notices a very similar fault to the one we have just mentioned, and which is still common. 'In fictitious narratives affection for parents, and for brothers and sisters, is often painted in agreeable colors, to excite the admiration and sympathy of children. Caroline, the charming little girl, who gets upon a chair to wipe away the tears that trickle down her eldest sister's cheek when her mother is displeased with her,* forms a natural and beautiful picture; but the desire to imitate Caroline must produce affectation. All the simplicity of youth is gone the moment children perceive that they are extolled for the expression of fine feelings, and fine sentiments.' †

For similar reasons it seems to us that it is a great error in many stories, to enlarge so much on the dress and personal appearance of children. Girls learn soon enough to prize the gift of beauty, and to be fond of fine clothes, even if they read nothing about them. The object of education should be, to diminish, rather than increase, their regard for these things. The crowning grace of beauty, is, that its possessor is unconscious of her charms. Passages like the following, therefore, are very exceptionable, as they can do nothing but promote vanity and a fondness for dress. The story from which they are taken, indeed, seems to represent dress and appearance as among the chief objects of life.

'How Emmeline's heart beat when she saw Mr Dubourg lead out Martenise, whose dress was a frock and trowsers of transparent white crape over white satin, and trimmed with blue flowers. In her hand she held the shawl, a long scarf of blue silk with silver balls at the ends.

'Martenise advanced with blushes and confusion, but still with her natural gracefulness. Emmeline was delighted to hear all around her a murmur of admiration. "What a lovely child!" "What a finely shaped head!" "What beautiful curls on her forehead!" "What sparkling black eyes!" "What a perfect little figure!"' ‡

It is as great an error, and one that we fear is common, to aim at giving virtue a picturesque appearance, by telling how interesting, how peaceful, or how happy a child *looked*, while performing a good action, or from the consciousness of having performed one. To us the propriety of introducing these descriptions is as questionable as those of the auburn locks, dark blue eyes, and bright sunny faces. Though virtuous emotions are often written legibly on the countenance, is not the tendency of thus constantly recurring to the sign of goodness, to turn the

* Berquin. † Practical Education, vol. i. p. 299. ‡ The Mirror, p. 257.

attention of the reader from the reality to the appearance; to make him consider the outward seeming more important than the inward disposition? Does it not, in short, encourage a petty hypocrisy? The following is an instance of this error, not at all more striking than many others.

'Laura entered the drawingroom with these good thoughts in her heart, which beamed from her eyes, and gave a sweet radiance to her whole countenance.' *

We regret to notice this fault in the 'Well-Spent Hour.' When any good action or virtuous emotion is spoken of, the effect on the countenance is frequently noticed. A little girl, after overcoming a slight feeling of envy, goes 'with a face as bright as usual' to comply with her friend's request. Would it not have been better to have said, that she *felt* as kind or as happy as usual? Again;—'Julia looked up in her aunt's face with such a happy, sweet expresson, that her aunt put her arms around her neck and kissed her.' It was probably far from the author's intention, in these and similar passages, to represent *appearance* as a matter of great importance. She describes it as beautiful or interesting, only because she thought it would convey to the minds of others the loveliness of its cause, in as lively a manner as it did to her own. But is it not to be feared that the young mind will be led by such descriptions, to think more of the effect than its cause?

The desire of copying nature and giving spirit to their pieces, frequently leads authors to use vulgar and cant phrases and ungrammatical expressions. The expediency of doing this in books for young readers, is very questionable. Most children, perhaps, have some familiar expressions, not strictly accurate or elegant; but as all have not the same, it seems a pity they should be taught new ones. It would be better to avoid such expressions as, 'I don't see the use for my share of making such a fuss;' 'We had a proper good time;' 'Lots and lots of nuts;' 'Take a good swig.' The last phrase is to be sure put in the mouth of a vulgar and bad boy; but the young are so prone to imitation, that we should guard them from such vulgarisms in books, almost as carefully as we should from low company in real life. Their apprehension is so quick and lively, that they are always ready to imitate every example that is set before them which does not require much effort. They cannot be always expected to perceive what examples are designed for them to follow and what to avoid. This remark may be extended even beyond the mere subject of language. No representation, either of morals or man-

* The Black Velvet Bracelet, p. 47.

ners, should be given in books, which we should not desire to have followed, unless direct censure is added.

Another common defect of style in children's books, is, caricaturing the language of childhood. Not only are the little boys and girls, and their fathers and mothers, made to talk like babies, but the authors themselves, when speaking in their own persons, frequently condescend to write and think like babies. Yet this fault, strange as it may seem, occurs very often in authors who are really the least versed in the natural language of childhood. With the grossest absurdity the writer at one moment soars aloft with Johnsonian pomposity, and the next sinks to the most infantine simplicity. Nor is this at all to be wondered at. The two faults, however opposite in appearance, arise from the same cause; an entire ignorance or utter disregard of what is natural and appropriate either to children or grown persons.

The quantity of sweet epithets which some of these writers scatter around is absolutely sickening. In some stories parents can never be mentioned without the accompanying epithet of 'dear.' 'The naughty boy did not mind what his dear mother said, but denied it again and again. Then his dear mother felt very unhappy.'* 'Mary's dear mother came out of the wood and ran to her darling child.' 'Mary Henderson, the little lost girl, was found by her dear mother.'† In one story the author not only says, 'sweet little birds,' 'sweetly confessed her fault,' &c., but actually talks of a 'jealous little conscience.'‡ In the same story in which these expressions occur, we meet with such florid and tumid passages as the following, which must sadly puzzle the 'sweet little' readers for whom the book is intended.

'In the midst of the darkness one bright luminary had arisen and illuminated the horizon of her heart, "and shed such an etherial beam over it," that, as it gradually rose higher and higher, every dark cloud, every unpropitious feeling was dispersed, and left the clear expanse of her innocent, untainted heart, smiling in all the beauty of conscious happiness.' §

A greater fault than inflated language, is weak and inconclusive reasoning. Where an argument is put into a child's mouth for his parent or friend to answer, the author should be careful that the answer is just, otherwise he may be sure that many of his little readers will detect the fallacy. Some writers, indeed, seem to think that any sort of reasoning is good enough for a child. It happens, in consequence, that a conclusion is often arrived at, when the reasoning is wholly inadequate to support it, or is not clearly and fully stated, which is generally the same thing to the child. Children who are quick and lively are often

* Botanical Garden, p. 6.
† Pet Lamb.
‡ The Prize, or the Three Half Crowns.
§ The Prize, p. 46.

very much puzzled and vexed by the sophistry and loose reasoning which they meet in books.*

In a story, called 'The Best Way to be Happy,' little Frederick is introduced playing with a toy-horse. He is at first delighted, and says to his father, 'You see how happy it has made me.' But soon finding some difficulty in harnessing his horse, he throws it down in a pet and begins to cry. His father reminds him of what he had just said, and Frederick replies, 'that the horse had made him happy then, but now it made him unhappy.'

'"How can that be, my dear," said his father, "when the horse has not changed at all? The horse is the same now that he was when you were sure it was that which made you so happy." "Then I am changed, papa," said Frederick. "Yes," said his father, "now you are right, the change is in you, not in the horse; and now you will understand me, when I tell you that it was not the horse, which made you feel so happy when you first played quietly with him, it was the state of your own mind; you had commanded yourself to stand still when you were washed and dressed, and you had just been kind to your little brother, and feeling good and happy, you amused yourself easily with your toy-horse, and you praised it to me, and thought that the horse made you happy, but do you think so now, my dear?" "No, papa." * * * "Now, my son, if it was not the horse that made you happy, was it the horse that made you unhappy?"'†

The boy very naturally thinks it was the horse, and that he was vexed because the harness slipped off. But his father soon convinces him that the cause of his unhappiness is in his own mind, and tells him that if the horse's sides had not been so slippery, there would have been some other thing about it that would have given him an opportunity of being impatient.

We have stated this argument quite at large, in order that we may not be thought to misrepresent it. The design of the story is very good; and with a few changes in the reasoning, it might have been made very satisfactory. The conclusion that the horse had nothing to do with Frederick's happiness or unhappiness, because the horse, always continuing the same, could not have produced different effects, is very illogical. The horse, it is true, was not the only source of his happiness or unhappiness; they depended in part on the state of his own mind. But yet it is undeniable that the horse contributed to his enjoyment when he first began to play with it, and was the occasion of his impatience afterwards. Can it indeed be necessary to go into an argument to show that in even the best disciplined minds, pleasure and pain

* See Practical Education, vol. i. pp. 294, 295.

† Christian Teacher's Manual, vol. i. p. 63. We trust that in our remarks on the story from the Manual, we shall not be considered as intimating any opinion against the general merit and value of that publication. The plan and judicious manner of conducting the work, ought to ensure it a wider circulation than we understand it has yet received.

depend in part on external circumstances? We did not expect, in a story for children, to meet with one of the mad notions of the Stoics, revived and exaggerated. The reasoning, it must be confessed, is enough to confound and puzzle a boy of five years old, but we doubt whether even he would be satisfied with it. We shall offer but one more specimen of bad logic, in a passage which seems to us very remarkable for confused and inconsequential reasoning.

'"When you do not like to be good, you are not good, and do not feel happy," said her mother; "and when you are good, you always love to be good, because you feel happy. To feel good and love to be good, makes us happy; and we pray our heavenly Father to make us good, because we wish to be happy. And if we wish to be good, and pray to be good, then God gives us the power to be good. This is the way our prayers make us good and happy."'*

Here is a complete chaos of *goods* and *happies*, which, as we cannot comprehend, we shall not attempt to explain.

Knowledge is no less desirable than reasoning. Where children's books attempt to give any scientific information, it is very important that it should be clear and correct. Every one knows how difficult it is to root out a false opinion formed in early years. We may learn the truth again and again in advancing life, but still the error will be ever obtruding itself in all its original freshness.

'*Aunt Maria.* Do you know why objects appear large or small, according to their distance?

'*James.* No. I do not think I do.

'*Aunt M.* It is because we see everything in an angle of vision, which grows narrower and narrower, till it terminates in a point. When walking down Beacon Street in the evening, have you never noticed that the lights on the Western Avenue seem to approach nearer and nearer each other till they touch?

'*James.* Yes. I have noticed it frequently; but I never thought what was the reason.

'*Aunt.* You have been over the avenue,—and therefore you know perfectly well that the lights are no nearer each other at one end than the other. You will notice the same thing when you approach a long grove of trees. The road in the centre seems to grow narrower and narrower in the distance, till the trees appear to touch. This is not the case; the road is as wide in one place as another; and it is only because the angle of vision grows smaller in proportion to its distance from the eye, and whatever object is seen in a narrow part of the angle will seem narrow, however large it may be in reality. For, if an angle be very wide at the beginning, and an object fills up the whole of it, the object must seem large; and if the angle is very small toward the end, and the same object is still crowded into it, it must seem smaller.'†

We are not sure that we comprehend this passage, and we think no child would know what to make of it. But it is clear that the writer does not understand what the angle of vision is.

* Little Susan, pp. 13, 14. † Juvenile Miscellany, vol. iii. p. 370.

'*Aunt.* The sky is a word of very doubtful meaning, my dear. What seems to us to be a broad, bright, blue canopy, stretched over our heads, is, in fact, a collection of vapors floating about in the air. Now the nearer the air is to the earth, the warmer and thinner it is; as you go higher and higher, it becomes more cold and dense. Dense means thick, compact, hard to get through.'*

This passage is a tissue of errors from beginning to end. It cannot be necessary to say that what we call the sky is not a collection of vapors; or that the higher parts of the atmosphere are more rare and not more dense than the lower.

'*Aunt.* Light passes through glass, chrystal [crystal], water, &c., and that is the reason why we call such kind of things *transparent.* Now you perceive that light coming into this three-cornered piece of glass, cannot go straight through,—for it has to turn round corners.'†

We do not understand what is meant by the light having to turn round corners. If any idea is conveyed to a child's mind by the passages that we have just cited, it will be error. Besides, they are so obscure and confused, that they must give a distaste for science.

It is difficult to decide in what manner fiction may properly be engrafted on history. This difficulty has pressed hard on novelists and poets. Nor have the writers of children's books been always successful in getting over it. It seems very clear that where a fictitious narrative is connected with known facts, however much it may be allowable to add, the fiction ought never to run counter to the truth. It offends the taste of a grown person to have a romance contradicting what he knows to be fact; and this contradiction inevitably obscures the truths of history in his mind. It is a matter of common remark that even well informed people, who are familiar with Shakspeare, are very apt to consider everything represented in his dramatic lives of the English kings as legitimate history. On children, as they do not readily comprehend the license which is taken in works of fancy, the effect of this contradiction of which we are speaking, is, to render their historical knowledge inaccurate, and confound the distinction between truth and falsehood. No fact, therefore, should be related in a story, which a common degree of knowledge with regard to the transactions to which it relates, would prove to be false. A tale called 'George and Georgiana' in the Juvenile Souvenir, is liable to this objection. Such a knowledge of the history of Pitcairn's Island, in which the scene is partly laid, as may be acquired from a few books in common use, would show that what is related could never have happened, and this would destroy the interest of the reader. Fiction, to interest, must be probable, must have the

* Juvenile Miscellany, vol. iii. p. 119. † Ibid. p. 113.

appearance of truth. We think it is an error on this account to lay the scene of a story in a small country town by name, or to represent the characters as living at a particular point in a large town. All the neighbours know that the facts stated cannot be true, and this collision between the reality and the fiction, diminishes the interest of the piece in which it occurs. Mr Cooper, in one of his novels, represents a Madam Lechmere as occupying a particular house in Boston at the time of the Revolution. People now living, who knew the family then actually residing in that house, must have been offended by this attempt to force a fictitious character into the spot.

It is becoming too common to drag private individuals, who are in full life, into these stories, and set them to work among the fabled personages of the scene. It seems to us that the feelings of the individuals thus brought forward, must be wounded by this want of delicacy. Besides, the introduction of real persons does not add to, but rather detracts from the verisimilitude of the scene. It disturbs the current of our ideas which is flowing smoothly on with the fiction, until it strikes against this real object. No one would think the picture of a lady improved by a piece of real lace or velvet pasted upon her neck.

It has, we fear, as we have already hinted, become too common to take it for granted, that everything written for children, is good. This is one of the fashions of the day. When the good intentions of a writer are manifest, we are too ready to give credit for good results. Not only is this true with regard to the public in general, but also as it applies to reviewers. This race of men have the credit of being morose and severe, but in criticising juvenile literature, they never fail to be easy and accommodating. The very persons, who, in examining other books, exhibit the most acute judgment, seem to lose it entirely in speaking of this class of works. Whether this is owing to courtesy to the gentler sex, from which the greater part of these books proceed, or any other cause, is not for us to determine. We cannot but regret it as a serious evil.

Miss Edgeworth recommends that every mother should read every book herself, before she puts it into the hands of her children. The advice is good, where it can be followed. But many persons, for obvious reasons, cannot follow it; and they are now obliged to judge of these little stories, as well as they can, from the opinions which they gather from newspapers and other journals. In fact, there is no class of writings, with regard to which most people rely so implicitly on the judgment of reviewers. It is therefore very important, that reviewers should speak with entire freedom of these works, and apply to them the common princi-

ples of criticism, judging of their merits by considering their object, and the means which are used to effect it.

We have spoken very freely of the defects in the juvenile literature of the present day, not from any blindness to its real merits, but because these merits are obvious, and are liable to make parents overlook great faults. The misfortune is, not so much that the good works are not known and read, as that a great many poor ones meet with too favorable a reception. However, that it may not be thought that we mean to proscribe all stories without mercy, we again declare that some of them are entitled to almost unqualified approbation. Even some of the works, of which we have had occasion to speak unfavorably, possess so many good qualities, that it would have been a far more agreeable task to have praised them, and in other pages of our journal we have praised them. But it is not our present purpose, for it would be impossible, to notice critically all the meritorious works in this branch of literature; though among the older books, 'Evenings at Home,' 'Sandford and Merton,' 'New Robinson Crusoe,' 'Elements of Morality,' 'Visit for a Week,' and all Miss Edgeworth's stories, particularly 'Early Lessons,' may be mentioned as almost unexceptionable. Their character is too well established to need our praise. Of the more recent publications, the 'Badge,' and some of the other works by the same author, are among the best stories for children that have appeared in this country. They have many of the excellences of Miss Edgeworth, the same high and accurate standard of morality, and the same felicity in selecting incidents suited to interest the young reader and impress on him the desired lesson. The 'Well-Spent Hour' is written with spirit, and some of the numbers convey moral and religious instruction in a very agreeable manner, without the aid of romantic incidents. It is, besides, in a great measure free from the faults which we have mentioned. The 'Beatitudes,' also, seems to us to be very successful in explaining and illustrating the christian virtues, in laying down moral distinctions with clearness and correctness, and in enforcing them by little narratives, which are very attractive. The 'Contributions of Q. Q.,' though written on the other side of the Atlantic, is well known here. It has been received with a favor not at all beyond its worth. The 'Visit to the Seaside' is also an English work of merit.

We are sometimes apprehensive that among the multitude of new publications, 'Evenings at Home,' and the other older books we have mentioned, which may be considered as children's classics, are in a measure neglected. Yet it is as true of that work now, as it was near thirty years ago, when Miss Edgeworth first said it, that 'upon a close examination it appears to be one of the best books for young people from seven to ten years old, that has yet appeared.'

It has been recommended to young students, by high authority, to read much, but not many books. The advice is very seasonable in the present rage for novelty. Children now seem to think that nothing is to be read more than once. After a first perusal a book is called old. It would be much better for the health of their minds, if they were induced to read over and over again whatever is really good, rather than be permitted to gorge themselves with all the crudities their parents' money can procure. Experience would soon convince them, that a good book will bear to be read more than once. Any one who will try any of Miss Edgeworth's tales, for on this subject we cannot refrain from recurring to this excellent writer, will find in them a perpetual freshness, even on a third or fourth perusal. We should scarce dare to tell how many times we have read every one of them, and every time with renewed, we had almost said increased, interest. Even if all the stories published were good, still, we think, it would be better for young people not to read so great a number. If by having fewer new books put into their hands, they were forced to read them a second or third time, the moral and sentiments would make a more deep and lasting impression, than they can do the first time, when the attention is chiefly attracted by the novelty of the story.

Children ought not to be allowed to read fictitious narratives too much. For even when they are selected in the most judicious manner, too great indulgence in them creates a perpetual uneasiness and craving for the same sort of excitement. It would be well if children, for their amusement, were led to read natural history, voyages and travels, history and biography, and anything, in short, calling the mind into exercise. Sir Walter Scott, in his 'Tales of a Grandfather,' has, with his usual felicity, given a specimen of the mode in which history may be made attractive to young readers. And such works as 'Belzoni in Egypt,' and 'Northern Regions,' if they have not all the interest of fiction, are useful, not merely for the information which they contain, but also because they encourage a taste for the pursuit of knowledge. Many of Miss Edgeworth's works have the same merit in a high degree; and a little work, called the 'Young Philosophers,' which has lately been published in Boston, though it has some few inaccuracies, contains useful and scientific information, conveyed in a pleasing manner.

We might easily extend our remarks. But it is sufficient to refer those who are interested in the subject of juvenile literature, to the chapter on books in Practical Education, where it is discussed with much grace and spirit, and in a very thorough and satisfactory manner. If that work was as generally read now as it deserves to be, we should have thought this article in a great measure unnecessary.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

40. **The Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, concerning the Only True God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. By the late Rev. JOHN CAMERON. London. Published for the Editor by J. Mardon, 105 Paul's Street, Finsbury. 1828. 12mo. pp. 117.**

APART from its intrinsic merits, this book has claims upon our notice from the circumstances of its origin and the history and character of its author. From the preface we learn that Mr Cameron was a native of Scotland, and that he entered upon the duties of the christian ministry among the descendants of the Scotch Covenanters, who in consequence of persecution had forsaken their native land, and settled on the northern shores of Ireland. Among them he preached the doctrines of Calvin in their full rigor and austerity, without attempting, as some modern preachers have done, to fashion them to popular taste and to publish them in a moderate tone. The high reputation which he early acquired among the Covenanters by his eloquence and zeal, procured for him a unanimous call from the Presbyterian congregation of Dunluce, in the county of Antrim. This call he accepted, and continued their minister for fortyfive years, till his death in 1799.

About the time of his settlement at Dunluce, a very important change took place in his religious opinions, which we will lay before our readers in his own words.

'I had been invited to dine with a dignitary of the established church, when, after dinner, as both of us were men of literary inquiry, the churchman said to me, "Cameron, have you seen Taylor of Norwich on Origiual Sin?" No, was my reply; nor do I wish to see it; it is a most dangerous production; and I have often cautioned my flock against its new fangled doctrines. "I shall give it you," said the divine, "when you are returning home." On my retiring, the dignitary said, "Cameron, you have forgotten the book, but I shall bring it you." With great reluctance did I remain until it was put into my hand; and I declare, such was my aversion to it, that I would as soon have been accompanied by his satanic majesty. Next morning I commenced a perusal of this production. As I advanced, a new and wonderful light broke in upon my mind. The author's exposition of scripture, and the illustration of the doctrine proposed, was so exceedingly simple and rational, and so consistent with the word of God, that I never met with anything which made such an impression upon my mind. For a few days I laid the book aside, pondering and revolving in my mind its important contents. I then resumed the perusal, carefully collating every text with the original, and comparing it with the word of God. The result was a complete and entire change in my religious sentiments. My former opinions and prejudices dissolved before the sun of truth, and disappeared as the morning dew before the rising orb of day.' pp. vi–viii.

The work at the head of this article, now for the first time offered to the public, is a posthumous one, and owes it appearance to the attempts recently made in the Synod of Ulster to check free inquiry and to compel uniformity of belief by the imposition of creeds and tests. Mr Cameron was a member of that synod, and a short time before his death presented this treatise to a friend, as a token of his regard. This friend, who was also a member of the Presbyterian body, is, like the author, now no more.

'A few years previous to his death, he permitted the present editor to take a copy of the work; and he accompanied the permission with the following observation: "That, whilst in respect of controverted doctrines, in matters of religion, the world was comparatively quiet, he had some doubts of the prudence of publishing what might eventually excite a spirit of altercation, such as had too often already disgraced the Christian annals, however purely it exhibited the character of Divine benignity and wisdom—however clearly it displayed 'the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ.' "But," he added, "should the attempt be renewed, in your day, to interfere with the rights of private judgment, and, in the country where we live, to bind Presbyterians to creeds which set reason and conscience at defiance, you have not only my permission to put this work abroad into the world, but it is my earnest desire that you do so."' pp. xiv–xv.

The editor, believing that the late intolerent proceedings of the Synod of Ulster indicated a state of things such as his friend had imagined, has felt bound to transfer his legacy to the public. We are glad that he has done so; and that he has put into our hands the views which a converted Unitarian, half a century ago, solitary and unaided, had deduced from the bible, 'concerning the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent.' We value this little treatise, because it exhibits plainly, as it professes to do, 'The Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures,' on this important subject. We do not know that it contains any original views or arguments in support of Unitarian Christianity; but it contains, what is far better, the old *scriptural* views and arguments, collected under appropriate

heads, and set forth with great clearness and strength. It is divided into two parts. The first part contains four chapters—1. On the Unity of God. 2. Of God the Father. 3. Of the Word, or the Word of God. 4. Of the the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of God. The second part contains six chapters—1. The Doctrine of the Ancient Prophets concerning Jesus Christ. 2. Of the Opinion which the Jews had of the Messiah in the Days of our Saviour. 3. Of the Opinions which the Multitude of the Jews had of Jesus Christ during his Public Ministry. 4. Of the Opinion which Christ's own Disciples had of him. 5. The True Character of Jesus Christ, described from his own Words and Actions, recorded by the Evangelists. 6. The Doctrine of the Apostles in their Public Discourses and Epistles concerning Jesus Christ.

The above abstract of the contents of the work will give the reader some idea of its design and plan. Of its execution he may be enabled to judge from the following extract.

'To suppose the Word and Spirit to be two divine persons distinct from the Father, and equal to him in all perfections, appears to be a wrong opinion, grounded upon certain figurative texts of scripture, understood in a literal sense. For, to affirm that three persons are equal in all respects, and that these three constitute only one God, is, in other words, affirming that God is a being compounded, consisting of, and made up of these three persons. And as no part of any thing or being can be equal to the whole, so none of these three, individually considered, can be equal to God. If each of these three persons be infinite in all perfections, then there must be three infinites. And if God, who is only one, be infinite in all perfections, then there must be three infinites equal only to one infinite.

'If it be said, that the idea annexed to the word person be different from that applied to the word God—then, let the difference be pointed out. For, if the word person signify an intelligent being, then these three persons must be three intelligent beings, distinct from each other, which must be three Gods. If to avoid this absurdity, it be said that the word God does not signify an intelligent being, this would be worse than the former—it would be atheism. If, to avoid these absurdities, it be said that the word person does not signify an intelligent being, but something belonging to such a being, of which we can form no conception, then these persons must signify three somethings, of which we know nothing.

'To say that this doctrine is a mystery, incomprehensible, beyond the investigation of human reason, is an apology for an absurdity. The scriptures always represent the only true God; i. e. the Father, as an intelligent being or person; and when the Word and Spirit are spoken of, they are described not as intelligent beings distinct from him, but as something belonging to him: the word, or the word of God, i. e. the Father.' pp. 34-36.

---

41. A Discourse delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. Frederick A. Farley, as Pastor of the Westminster Congregational Society in Providence, Rhode Island, September 10, 1828. By William Ellery Channing. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 28.

THE great reputation of Dr Channing, as a preacher and writer, is more than sustained by this discourse. The Dudleian Lecture excepted, it is the most finished of his sermons. It exhibits with as much completeness as could be looked for in the compass of one discourse, his high, and in some respects, peculiar and original views of theology; and is as eloquent as his happiest efforts are wont to be. Its main ideas respecting the nature of man, the character of God, and the spirit of Christianity, are the same as those which were given in the sermon at the ordination of Mr Motte; but here they are more fully developed, defended against objections, and applied, in the sequel, to the occasion.

We would not, by any means, require of a preacher, that in handling a point of common ethics or divinity, he should stop to guard his every position against all possible attack, but we are of opinion that views like those brought forward by Dr Channing in his two last sermons, ought to be accompanied with answers to the objections which would naturally be urged against them, even by many of the professors of a liberal system of theology. These answers would be, for the most part, explanations and illustrations of new or unusual positions; but such explanations and illustrations are very much needed by those to whom the positions are new or unusual, and who are not contented with a bare statement of them, but wish to have them presented with their proper limitations and connexions, as they exist in their completeness in the author's mind. It is not necessary that this defence should be entered into every time the subjects are brought forward. It is sufficient that it be made till the subjects are well developed, and may reasonably be supposed to be understood, in their different bearings and aspects, by the intelligent of all parties.

Such a defence has been given in the sermon before us, and in a masterly

style. To us, the consideration of objections, which constitutes a large portion of the sermon, is the most interesting portion of the whole. As a specimen of the manner in which the work is executed, we offer the following extract.

'It is said, that men cannot *understand* the views which seem to me so precious. This objection I am anxious to repel, for the common intellect has been grievously kept down and wronged through the belief of its incapacity. The pulpit would do more good, were not the mass of men looked upon and treated as children. Happily for the race, the time is passing away, in which intellect was thought the monopoly of the few, and the majority were given over to hopeless ignorance. Science is leaving her solitudes to enlighten the multitude. How much more may religious teachers take courage to speak to men on subjects, which are nearer to them than the properties and laws of matter, I mean their own souls. The multitude, you say, want capacity to receive the great truths relating to their spiritual nature. But what, let me ask you, is the christian religion? A spiritual system, intended to turn men's minds upon themselves, to frame them to watchfulness over thought, imagination, and passion, to establish them in an intimacy with their own souls. What are all the christian virtues, which men are exhorted to love and seek? I answer, pure and high motions or determinations of the mind. That refinement of thought, which, I am told, transcends the common intellect, belongs to the very essence of Christianity. In confirmation of these views, the human mind seems to me to be turning itself more and more inward, and to be growing more alive to its own worth, and its capacities of progress. The spirit of education shows this, and so does the spirit of freedom. There is a spreading conviction that man was made for a higher purpose than to be a beast of burden, or a creature of sense. The divinity is stirring within the human breast, and demanding a culture and a liberty worthy of the child of God. Let religious teaching correspond to this advancement of the mind. Let it rise above the technical, obscure, and frigid theology which has come down to us from times of ignorance, superstition, and slavery. Let it penetrate the human soul, and reveal it to itself. No preaching, I believe, is so intelligible, as that which is true to human nature, and helps men to read their own spirits.

'But the objection which I have stated not only represents men as incapable of understanding, but still more of being moved, quickened, sanctified, and saved, by such views as I have given. If by this objection nothing more is meant, than that these views are not alone or of themselves sufficient, I shall not dispute it; for true and glorious as they are, they do not constitute the whole truth, and I do not expect great moral effects from narrow and partial views of our nature. I have spoken of the godlike capacities of the soul. But other and very different elements enter into the human being. Man has animal propensities as well as intellectual and moral powers. He has a body as well as mind. He has passions to war with reason, and self-love with conscience. He is a free being and a tempted being, and, thus constituted he may and does sin, and often sins grievously. To such a being, religion, or virtue, is a conflict, requiring great spiritual effort, put forth in habitual watchfulness and prayer; and all the motives are needed, by which force and constancy may be communicated to the will. I exhort not the preacher to talk perpetually of man "as made but a little lower than the angels." I would not narrow him to any class of topics. Let him adapt himself to our whole and various nature. Let him summon to his aid all the powers of this world and the world to come. Let him bring to bear on the conscience and the heart God's milder and more awful attributes, the promises and threatenings of the divine word, the lessons of history, the warnings of experience. Let the wages of sin here and hereafter be taught clearly and earnestly. But amidst the various motives to spiritual effort, which belong to the minister, none are more quickening than those drawn from the soul itself, and from God's desire and purpose to exalt it, by every aid consistent with its freedom. These views I conceive are to mix with all others, and without them all others fail to promote a generous virtue. Is it said, that the minister's proper work is, to preach Christ and not the dignity of human nature? I answer, that Christ's greatness is manifested in the greatness of the nature which he was sent to redeem; and that his chief glory consists in this, that he came to restore God's image where it was obscured or effaced, and to give an everlasting impulse and life to what is divine within us. Is it said, that the malignity of sin is to be the minister's great theme? I answer, that this malignity can only be understood and felt, when sin is viewed as the ruin of God's noblest work, as darkening a light brighter than the sun, as carrying discord, bondage, disease, and death into a mind framed for perpetual progress towards its Author. Is it said, that terror is the chief instrument of saving the soul? I answer, that if by terror, be meant a rational and moral fear, a conviction and dread of the unutterable evil incurred by a mind which wrongs, betrays, and destroys itself, then I am the last to deny its importance. But a fear like this, which regards the debasement of the soul as the greatest of evils, is plainly founded upon and proportioned to our conceptions of the greatness of our nature. The more common terror, excited by vivid images of torture and bodily pain, is a very questionable means of virtue. When strongly awakened, it generally injures the character, breaks men into cowards and slaves, brings the intellect to cringe before human authority, makes man abject before his Maker, and, by a natural reaction of the mind, often terminates in a presumptuous confidence, altogether distinct from virtuous selfrespect, and singularly hostile to the unassuming, charitable spirit of Christianity. The preacher should rather strive to fortify the soul against physical pains, than to bow it to their mastery, teaching it to dread nothing in comparison with sin, and to dread sin as the ruin of a noble nature.' pp. 23—26.

Such views of Christian theology as these, defended and recommended thus, cannot fail to exercise an elevating influence on the moral and religious world.

43. Presumptive Arguments in Favor of Unitarianism. By M. L. Hurlbut. Boston. Bowles & Dearborn. 1828. 12mo. pp. 42.

WHOEVER is acquainted with the admirable memoir prefixed to Sermons by the late Rev. A. Foster, of Charleston, S. C., must welcome another production from the same classical pen. Mr Hurlbut, in the pamphlet before us, has stepped aside from the beaten track. The stock of direct arguments in favor of Unitarianism, though not indeed exhausted, has been employed of late years among us to an extent that must satisfy every mind in a state to be satisfied. Our author exhibits the subject in a somewhat new point of view. Granting, for the moment, that the scriptural arguments on both sides of the question may balance each other, he proceeds to inquire whether all the antecedent probabilities do not bear entirely in favor of Unitarianism. The investigation we deem to be as seasonable as it is manifestly well conducted. We have no doubt that many minds have become wearied and confused, by the apparently contradictory testimonies, adduced on the opposite sides of the principal controversy which has agitated the religious world. Yet still men must be anxious to know the truth, and must rejoice to be calmly led by some master hand to a solid eminence, on which they can repose with steadiness and satisfaction. For our own part, we think the task is here conclusively done. We are utterly at a loss to conceive how a Trinitarian could devise similar arguments in favor of his own doctrines. Indeed, the bare mention of presumptive arguments and antecedent probabilities in favor of Trinitarianism, savours somewhat, we are free to confess, of the unnatural and incredible. Mr Hurlbut has happily no paradox to maintain. He proceeds along a broad and open road, and gathers his numerous illustrations and proofs from every quarter of the world of nature, of the human mind, and of the known character of God. His thoughts, if not always original, are always dressed in a new and peculiar drapery of their own. We subjoin one or two extracts, as specimens of the beauty and force of his style, and for the sake of attracting to this little work the attention of our readers in general.

'Orthodoxy has so long had possession of the public mind, that its roots have spread far, and struck deep. It has infused its spirit into the whole mass of our literature. It has tinged the very atmosphere through which the light of heaven visits our eyes. It has tainted the very springs and vehicles of thought. It is no wonder, that those who come to the study of this question in the scriptures, with minds preoccupied by artificial formulas, inculcated from infancy into the warm and yielding texture of the growing intellect; with prejudices trained and fostered till they have overgrown the whole mind, should find in the scriptures the very things they come to look for. It were strange indeed if they should fail to do so. Nor is this all. Fear has been enlisted on the side of error, and in aid of prejudice; fear, at once the offspring and the parent of ignorance and imbecility of mind. Men have been taught to believe that it is unsafe to trust their own reason and judgment; that it is hazardous to inquire into the grounds of their faith; and fatal to relinquish certain articles of the popular creed. It is time men were disabused of this delusion, which, if universal, would endue error, once prevalent, with immortality. Let men once be convinced that they may examine the claims of Unitarianism without danger to their virtue, their peace, or their hopes, and they will not, we are persuaded, be long in embracing it. We hope we shall be able to show them, in the course of the following remarks, that they may do this; and that in so doing, they will only follow the guidance of nature, reason, and common sense.' pp. 4, 5.

'Reason and nature teach us, that God is good, in the obvious and popular sense of the term; good in such a sense that he cannot perform an action, the final purpose of which is the infliction of suffering; good in such a sense, that he cannot do that, which, on a full view of the case, would, in a human agent, be denominated cruel or unjust; good in such a sense, that he will not punish an innocent being for the crimes which another has committed; good, in fine, in such a sense that he cannot punish a frail creature, for not performing what the very law of his being had disqualified him to perform. Suppose we admit, that these views *may* be, in some measure, incorrect; that a stronger and a brighter light shed from heaven on the mental eye may enable us to see further into the deep mysteries of the Divine character; and that these dictates of reason may be set aside by the decisions of superior authority. Let us suppose that such evidence *may* be presented in the gospel as shall constrain us to admit, that the goodness of God is something diverse, in kind as well as degree, from the same quality in man; and that he may, without impeachment of his character, perform what to us seems palpable cruelty and injustice. But is this *probable*? Is there not a strong presumption beforehand that no doctrines inconsistent with this view of the divine goodness will be found there? Ought we to anticipate a revelation from heaven, which should unteach us all we had learned in the school of nature; unsettle the fixed principles of the intellect; falsify all the conclusions of reason, our primary guide amid the dark and intricate windings of our earthly course, and thus extinguish the light which God himself had enkindled in our minds? Yet such, if the views of our opponents be correct, is the character and tendency of the revelation God has sent us by his Son.' pp. 12, 13.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Mission in Bengal.—[In our last number we gave that part of the 'Second Memoir respecting the Unitarian Mission in Bengal,' which relates to the 'Cooperation of Foreign Unitarians,' the 'Employment of a Missionary,' a 'Chapel for English Worship,' and a 'Native Service.' We now redeem our promise to present our readers with the remainder of that valuable document.]

'V. *Education.*—The next subject to which the Committee have directed their attention is *Education*, to which they have no hesitation in avowing that they principally look for the renovation and improvement of the Hindoo character. The difficulties they have had to contend with in securing the aid and in making the arrangements that have been already detailed, and their yet limited resources, have hitherto prevented them as a body from taking any share in the means employed for the diffusion of native education; but a distinguished native member of the Committee, about the time of its formation, established an Anglo-Hindoo School, chiefly at his own expense, but occasionally aided by the liberal contributions of a few friends. The object of this institution is to instruct a limited number of boys in the English language and in the elements of general knowledge, and although this Committee are in no respect connected with it and have possessed no control over the mode in which it has been conducted, they have sincere pleasure in directing the attention of the public to this laudable exertion of private philanthropy. The extent of the Committee's exertions for the promotion of Education will necessarily depend upon the means placed at their disposal for that purpose by the public in India, England, and America. In the measures that may be adopted they are desirous of proceeding with great caution, in order that the object may not be defeated by a defective or erroneous system; for, although they do not expect instantaneous conversions as the probable or natural consequences of the means employed to diffuse education, they cannot resist the conviction that the beneficial effects actually produced, although considerable, are inadequate to the expenditure that has been incurred and the exertions made. The Committee are not able at present to point out the cause to which this should be attributed, if their apprehension is well founded; nor are they prepared to detail any general plan of education which they would recommend for adoption in preference to those which are in operation. But there is one branch of this subject—the kind and degree of connexion between education and religion—on which the most vague or the most opposite notions are entertained, and on which they think it proper at this time distinctly to state the principles by which they will be guided. 1. Education will never be employed by this Committee as a direct means of proselytism to Christianity: they say *direct* means, for the diffusion of education and the spread of knowledge generally they consider in a high degree, although in an *indirect* manner, friendly to the cause of Christianity. What they mean to affirm, is, that in any institution established by them or placed under their control for the promotion of education, no one religion will be recommended more than another to the attention and favor of the pupils. To attempt to initiate the infant mind into the peculiarities of any religion or sect would, they consider, be unwise in any case, and in the case of Hindoos receiving education from the benevolence of Christians, it would be cruel to the children, unjust and in most instances deceptive to the parents, and inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the Christian Religion. 2. But the opposite evil must also be guarded against, for if religion and morality are not inculcated, they will not be understood or practised any more than astronomy and navigation without being taught. They should be taught, therefore, but taught in such a way as to be consistent with perfect good faith to the parents and children, without exciting their prejudices, and without violating the principles which a judicious parent would lay down for the religious education of his own child. For this purpose the *facts* of religion should be

taught. The history of opinions in philosophy and science is one of the most interesting branches of human knowledge, and in like manner religion should be taught as a branch of general knowledge, as a department of history, the history of all religions and all sects in all ages and in all countries. Not only should the *facts* of religion be taught, but, for the sake of moral effect, the universally recognised *truths* and *obligations* of religion, the being and attributes of God, his love of virtue and hatred of vice, the personal, relative, and social duties, should be inculcated. The most bigoted idolater in India, if left to his own unbiassed impressions and not rendered suspicious by attempts at proselytism, would not object to his children being taught the plain and undoubted facts, truths, and duties of religion. The Committee are aware that this simplification of religion to the minds of native youth would be the best preparation for their reception of Christianity when they come to mature years and judgment, but this is an advantage gained openly and fairly, in consistence with the known religious character of parents and children, and in such a way as to cherish, support, and strengthen the best principles of human nature, instead of oppressing their intellect and obscuring their moral perceptions, by indoctrinating them with distinctions and opinions which are beyond the reach of their faculties. Such are the views that are entertained by the Committee on this important subject, and they give expression to them on this occasion, both because they are regarded as just in themselves and deserving to be generally acted upon, and also because it is hoped that many will be induced to give their aid to plans of education formed accordingly. What specific plans the Committee may adopt for the advancement of education will depend upon the degree of public support they receive and the information they may be able to collect on the present state of education in this country—a subject on which the Committee hope to communicate the result of their inquiries in the next Annual Report.

'VI. *Tracts.*—Short, plain, and rational Tracts are calculated to diffuse information and to excite inquiry, and are therefore a valuable means of intellectual, moral, and religious improvement. There will accordingly be found in the Appendix, a list of books, pamphlets, and tracts that may be had of the Committee's booksellers, and the Committee recommend the purchase of them for distribution as a means both of increasing the funds applicable to the printing of tracts and also of spreading pure religion. With regard to future publications, the Committee have in their possession a MS. translation of the Gospel of Matthew into Bengalee, the joint production of the Rev. William Yates, a Baptist Missionary, and of Rammohun Roy and Mr Adam, two of the Members of this Committee, which, if they had the necessary funds, they would immediately print under the superintendence and revision of the two last mentioned individuals. Rammohun Roy also proposes executing his long suspended design, of translating his Compilation of the Precepts of Jesus into Bengalee and Sunskrit, and of placing his translation at the disposal of the Committee. The Committee are quite aware that translations into Bengalee and Sunskrit of those portions of Scripture have already been executed, but under circumstances which unavoidably attach much error and imperfection to them, and they therefore consider that they would render an eminent service to the cause of Christianity in this country, if they could induce their learned Associate to carry into effect his original purpose, of presenting to his countrymen the Precepts of Jesus, in the vernacular dialect of Bengal, and in the classical language of India. The Committee have also in view the publication of a Series of Tracts on the Unity of God, in English, Bengalee, and Sunskrit, establishing the truth of that doctrine, by proofs drawn from Natural and Revealed Religion, and considering it as opposed both to Polytheism and Trinitarianism. This series of tracts would also be well adapted for distribution among Mussulmans, if translated into Hindostanee, Persian, and Arabic, to make them acquainted with Unitarians, as a distinct denomination of Christians, and by this means to produce a favourable impression on their minds respecting the truth and excellence of Christianity, but the want of funds will prevent the Committee at present from engaging in this undertaking. The publications of the

Committee have generally been printed at the Unitarian Press which belongs to Rammohun Roy; in some cases entirely at his expense, and in others, at the expense to the Committee only of press-work and paper.

'VII. *Library.*—Public Libraries may be made very effective instruments for the diffusion of religious as well as of general knowledge. Confessedly very few individuals ever read books written exclusively on the subject of religion, and one reason is, that the public have not the requisite facilities and means of comparison and selection. There are Libraries to supply the public taste on almost every other subject, but there is no Library in Calcutta open to the public, well supplied with Theological works of every description. The most valuable Theological collections are not generally accessible, and those that are open to the public are extremely meagre and almost exclusively sectarian. If all these Collections were thrown into one, it would be a great means of spreading religious knowledge, especially when aided by the weekly discourses of the public teachers of Christianity. Why is it that the voice of the preacher falls so powerless on the ear? It is because, among other reasons, the minds of the hearers have not been exercised by previous reading and reflection on the same or similar subjects. Let then books of religion be put within their reach,—books on every subject that can be considered as directly connected with religion,—Theology, Mental Philosophy, Ethics, Education, Missions, &c. Let all denominations of Christians unite in forming such a Library, and the most beneficial effects may be anticipated in conjunction with the other means that are employed for exciting an encreased degree of attention to the subject of religion, and forming the public mind to a just appreciation of its important truths. The Committee do not expect that other Christian sects will join with them at present in these views, but however distant the prospect of such co-operation may be, they have determined, in the mean time, to pursue the object with the means they possess, and with the aid, in books or in pecuniary contributions, which public-spirited individuals or societies in India or in foreign countries may be disposed to give. A small Library has been formed, and several valuable donations of books have been received from various individuals both in this country and abroad, besides additions that have been made to it by purchase, at the expense of the Committee. It is open to the public, and various individuals have at different times received books from it. The Committee invite all the aid and patronage which such a Theological Library may appear to the public to deserve. They tender their thanks for those donations of books that have already been received, and they will gratefully acknowledge all other gifts, whether of orthodox or heterodox works, that may hereafter be sent to them.

'VIII. *Madras.*—Mr William Roberts, a native Hindoo has, with great zeal and industry, been laboring at Madras for several years, under the patronage of the English Unitarians, as the Pastor of a small Native congregation of Unitarian Christians. In compliance with Mr Roberts's request and with the recommendation of his English friends and supporters, it was at one time in contemplation to authorize Mr Adam to proceed to Madras to ascertain the present state and prospects of Unitarianism at that Presidency; but after mature consideration this step was deemed inexpedient, in consequence both of the inadequacy of the funds applicable to such a purpose, and the importance of Mr Adam's presence in Calcutta at the present juncture. The Committee have no means of judging of the utility of Mr Roberts's labours except from his own reports, but although they are evidently limited to a very humble and contracted sphere, yet the Committee are strongly impressed with the conviction of the integrity of his character, his firmness in maintaining Divine truth under the most discouraging circumstances, and his unwearied perseverance in his endeavours for promoting the moral and religious improvement of his little flock, and for extending the knowledge of Unitarian Christianity. The Committee, therefore, to express their sympathy with him in his labours, and to encourage and aid him in their prosecution, presented him with a donation of 100 Madras Rupees. A further donation of 350 Madras Rupees was made to Mr Roberts, being part of a sum of 375 dollars received from America, but which does not appear in the Committee's Accounts, as it was placed at Mr Adam's disposal.

'IX. *Funds.*—Annexed is the Trea-

surer's Statement of Accounts with him to the close of the present year, including three separate funds, viz. the Missionary Fund, the Chapel Fund, and the Contingent Fund. 1. The Missionary Fund has been created by loans from individuals in Calcutta, to whom the sums borrowed are payable by the Committee without interest, whenever the voluntary subscriptions received from the public shall enable them: the principal sum is Sa. Rs. 25,000, and the interest is applied to the support of a Unitarian Missionary. 2. The Chapel Fund has been formed by donations received from individuals in this country, in England, and in America, and the Treasurer's Statement shows a cash balance in its favor of Sa. Rs. 9557 2, besides the ground purchased for S. Rs. 12,250 and Calcutta subscriptions still remaining unpaid to the amount of 5 or 6000 Rupees. 3. The Contingent Fund has been formed by monthly, quarterly, and annual subscriptions received in Calcutta, and amounting, when reduced to one denomination, to about 160 Rupees per month: A donation to this fund of Sa. Rs. 1562 1 8 has also been received from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, together with a promise, after the lapse of two years, of an annual subscription of 500 Rs. The present balance in favour of this Fund is Sa. Rs. 4455 1 4. The purposes to which this Fund has been and is at present applied, are the payment of the rent of the Hurkaru Public Rooms and of the organ used in public worship, the employment of a native copyist, a messenger, and occasionally a pundit, the printing of tracts, the freight and custom-duties on shipments of books, the postage of letters and parcels, stationary, and all other variable and incidental charges arising out of the business of the Committee.

'X. *Organization of the Committee.* It has already been stated, in one of the publications of the Committee, that, although they assumed this name, they did not thereby intend to describe themselves as the representatives of a larger body. They were constituted a Committee by their own voluntary act, without reference to a higher authority, and they received others into their number, according as persons were found disposed to associate with them, limiting the increase however to such a number as would not throw any obstacle in the way of an easy interchange of opinions on the different measures submitted for consideration. This constitution of the Committee, although originally necessary, in consequence of the small number of individuals in India who took an active interest in the promotion of Unitarian Christianity, is attended with this practical inconsistency, that while the Committee are a public body, possessing public property in trust for specific purposes, and derived in part from individuals not belonging to their own body, yet they are not amenable to the public, because not elected, but hitherto only voluntarily associated. The number of public professors of Unitarianism in Calcutta, however, has recently experienced a considerable increase, and the Committee therefore propose to render themselves elective, in order that Calcutta Unitarians may possess a real and direct control over a body which represents them, and that every individual of them may be the more induced to contribute his personal and zealous exertions for the promotion of its objects. Considering also the extending relations and prospects of Unitarian Christianity in this country, the local appellation assumed seems now to be less appropriate than it originally was, and the Committee therefore recommend that the present opportunity be taken, to make the designation more comprehensive, and with that view they suggest that the new institution should be called, THE BRITISH INDIAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION. This will not only more correctly express the extent of the objects contemplated, but will also be a call on all Unitarians in every part of India where the existence of the Association may become known, to unite with each other and with the Unitarians in Calcutta, for the promotion of those objects, by the formation of Auxiliary associations, which it cannot be expected will be done, while the present limited title of the Parent Institution is retained. The Calcutta Unitarian Committee have therefore resolved, that if those gentlemen who have subscribed in aid of their funds, and are now present, will form themselves into a Society having the same objects in view, and willing to assume all their responsibilities, they will transfer all their rights, titles, powers, and properties to that Society, or to its Com-

mittee, for the time being. In the confidence that the measure proposed will meet with the approbation of this Meeting, the following Resolutions are submitted for consideration.—

'1. That this meeting does hereby form itself into a Society which shall be called the British Indian Unitarian Association, having the same objects and principles as the Calcutta Unitarian Committee, assuming all the responsibilities of that Committee, and receiving all their rights, titles, powers, and properties.

'2. That the Members of the Calcutta Unitarian Committee be requested to act as the Committee of the British Indian Unitarian Association, for the ensuing year, under the Rules and Regulations formed by the Calcutta Unitarian Committee for itself, with power to supply vacancies in their own number; and that the Committee be requested to frame and submit to the next Annual meeting, such further Regulations as may appear necessary to give efficiency to the Association.

'3. That this meeting views with deep interest the combined exertions of English and American Unitarians to establish a Mission in this country, pledges itself to zealous and preserving cooperation with them, confides in their continued sympathy and aid in the prosecution of this object, and earnestly solicits the assistance and countenance of such Unitarians in Europe and America as have hitherto withheld their support.

'4. That this Meeting invites all Unitarians, whether Christian or Hindoo, to form themselves into Associations Auxiliary to the British Indian Unitarian Association, and to place themselves in communication with the Secretary of that Association.

'The Calcutta Unitarian Committee conclude this Report of their proceedings with the assurance that, under whatever name they may act, they will continue sacredly to devote their best exertions to the extension of pure Christianity in India. They are cheered by the prospect which has begun to open before them. They earnestly invite all who value rational religion to cooperate with them. And they humbly supplicate on their past and future labors the blessing of that Being "from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed."'

Correspondence of the American Unitarian Association, on the state of Unitarian Christianity. [Continued from p. 352.]

HAMPDEN COUNTY.

'I am fully aware of the reports which have reached you, respecting the state of Unitarianism in this quarter, and I know they must have had the more weight, because supported, if not by the evidence, at least by the desponding tone of many Unitarians. But from whatever quarter such statements come, they are entirely without foundation. Unitarianism is making just the advance, which any reasonable man might have anticipated; and I speak deliberately when I say, that, if its prospects might be more animating, they could not well be surer. Many of those, who first embraced our faith in this region, expected an immediate revolution, thinking that no one could fail to welcome the light—they found that many, who, though they had not been Unitarians, had long been prepared for the new faith, joined them at once; and from this movement they took an encouragement, which was not warranted by our knowledge of human nature, because they might have known that the moment they had formed themselves into a society, they had brought matters to that state that every man must choose his party, and after the lines were decidedly drawn, it was a serious thing, and required great resolution, to pass from one side to the other. Such instances have been—there have been a few in this town, who have passed from the Calvinistic society to mine, but in each instance, they were men of great deliberation and uncommon firmness, and it was plain, that without those traits of character, they would have remained with their party to this day, rather than have encountered the difficulty and odium of a separation. Such being the obstacles to the increase of our societies, their members became a little discouraged. You can judge of the reasonableness of their anticipations, if you consider, that, in the country, every man is under the superintendence of his neighbours, generally has his wife against him in his liberality, and we have no loose and shifting population in this region, where old habits, prejudices, and opinions have a power, that may be measured by the

number of their years. You can judge, then, whether, when I tell you that Unitarianism is surely advancing, it is not as much as we could rationally expect, though not all we might desire.

'I confess that it is almost with regret that I hear of associations and audiences gathered in small towns, where there are not Unitarians enough to form a regular society. It affords a momentary joy and triumph, and that is all. They soon find that they have made themselves a mark, and have cut down the bridge by which others might have joined them. I know it is hard for them to be destitute of the ordinances of religion; but they do not gain them by their separation, except when some liberal preacher happens to stray in their neighbourhood; and they put off, indefinitely, the hope of having societies, churches, and ministers of their own.

'I think that the reason, I have given, is enough to show, that no sudden revolution could have been expected in this region. There are other causes, that operate also everywhere against us. Gold and silver are the measures of value, with the people at large, and they see that the Unitarians give less to what pass for religious purposes, than the Orthodox. Doubtless many sound reasons and explanations may be given for that difference, but the misfortune is, that the people generally cannot be made to comprehend, that what a man gives is not a just measure of his devotion to his faith. Besides, it seems as if the liberality of many consisted wholly in their aversion to lectures, religious charities, &c., things harmless enough in themselves, and in the hands of the Orthodox, engines of power. Many of the most upright and enlightened men who become Unitarians, are those, who, from their former aversion to the received faith, have passed for infidels or indifferent. They would recommend any other cause to the people at large, but they rather discredit this—and there are always some, like the recruits of David at Adullam, who attend Unitarian meetings, for the sake of hearing a little common sense, occasionally, under the name of religion, though they care nothing about the matter. These are obstacles, especially the money-giving, which do much to withstand a general impression in our favor. This brings me back to the point with which I started, that we are gaining as fast as we ought to expect. I do not mention these things by way of accounting for our slow growth, for I know of no society in this region, growing faster than ours. Our pews are filling up slowly, it is true, but well; and though some of our more ardent members have been at times needlessly concerned, there has never been an instance in which the Orthodox have made the least impression on our prosperity or our numbers. In truth I know of no disposition to injure us.—If there is any, it is not in the Orthodox clergyman, who is uniformly fair and manly, and I have not the least doubt wishes well to my people and to me.'

1. FRANKLIN COUNTY.

'I am perfectly satisfied, that in the county of Franklin the cause of Unitarianism is gradually advancing. So far as I recollect, there has been no secession on the ground of principles, from my parish for the space of ten or fifteen years. Calvinists, indeed, we have, and always have had; but they are generally satisfied with serious, practical preaching. In M———, the next town on the east, where they had had an Orthodox minister for almost twenty years, there was a Unitarian society established two years ago, which has increased. Similar remarks would apply to the state of things in C———. The Unitarian society in H———, though small in the number of actual subscribers, is, I believe, increasing both in number and influence, and there is reason to hope, that, at no distant period, it may constitute the majority of the town. In C———, a Unitarian society was established about a year since. That town, though large and wealthy, has not been distinguished by religious zeal of any kind; and although we may hope, we cannot be sanguine of great success in that place. There has lately been a Unitarian society organized in S———, consisting of twentyfive or thirty members in its origin, which, it is expected, will be considerably increased by those who are already prepared to subscribe. A small society has likewise been organized in G———, and the new Unitarian society in N———, which is an object of as much interest, perhaps, as any other, is in a very hopeful state. We have had hopes of something effectual in the large town of C———; but there is a want of spirit there, and

they have lately buried the most efficient member of the Unitarian band.

'As to the intolerance of Orthodoxy, I suppose it is now, as it has been several years past. The leaders of that party doubtless wish to keep what we call truth entirely out of sight and hearing, and we have as little reason to doubt, that, with a considerable part of the community, their wishes have the authority of law. Still I am inclined to think that the number of those, who are willing to read and hear on both sides of the question, is increasing.

2. FRANKLIN COUNTY.

'Last winter quite an effort was made to get up revivals in this quarter. A "Circular Conference" was organized—that is, every Orthodox parish in the county was to send its minister and a lay delegate, or two lay delegates, to a particular parish, for the purpose of holding a conference, or of producing an excitement. Thus all the parishes were in turn to be visited. Conferences have been held in a number of parishes, but their labors have thus far been wholly without success. No symptoms of a revival have yet been visible, except a few additional meetings at the time of visitation—and these have, in one instance, at least, produced a reaction.

'Some other gentlemen will be able to give you a more correct general view of the state of things than I can. I have been here so little time, that I am not qualified to judge comparatively. I however met with the association last Tuesday at D———, and among other things, it was asked, whether the members would assist those societies which were springing up, and who wanted to hear the truth—and the answer was, "If there were only *one* or *two* of them, it would be pleasant to give them assistance, but there were so *many*, it is a thing impracticable." There is a new society lately collected in G———. The new societies are of course small, but most of them raise some money to pay for preaching. I know of no place where a missionary could be employed to greater advantage than in this region. There is a spirit of inquiry among the people, and my judgment would be, from what I have seen and heard, that the prospects of Liberal Christianity were never so good in the valley of the Connecticut as at the present time.'

MIDDLESEX COUNTY.

'I have noticed with astonishment and grief indeed, but not with dismay, the confident and exaggerated assertions, statements, and insinuations, to which you allude. They indicate, I must think, in those who make them, a consciousness, not of the increasing strength, but of the increasing weakness, of their party. But with what expectation are such things said, published, and spread abroad before the community? Do the authors of these things believe, that the people will receive as truth whatever is told them—that they can be managed and moulded to any purpose, and that their cause will flourish, while the character of the means used to promote it, is disregarded? If such be their belief, and it would seem as though it must be, they will at length find themselves most bitterly disappointed. The people will maintain their religious freedom, and their Protestant rights; they will improve them in searching the Scriptures for themselves, and in living together as neighbours, friends, and christian brethren.

'The history of this business for many years past, clearly shows, that the spirit of Protestantism, in this Commonwealth, is too powerful, too enlightened, too much awake, and too jealous of its rights, to be outwitted, crushed, or manacled by the wiles, threats, or combinations of its enemies. This spirit was never so active, as at the present moment, in this Commonwealth. Why have the more intelligent and influential of the laity, so very generally aroused themselves to enter the lists as combattants in this great warfare? Why are these things seen, and heard, and read, and known of all men? The answer is obvious. The people have taken their stand and are determined that taxation and representation shall go together in Church as well as in State, and that they will not submit to wear the yoke of "Saintly Domination." Such is, I am confident, the spirit of this Commonwealth, and, I am sure, of this section of it.

'Now I view this spirit, as essentially the spirit of Unitarianism, and as securing most certainly its progress and its ultimate triumph. Another cheering sign of the times in this region is, the increase of the spirit of love and peace among many in all the

denominations. The great mass even of the Orthodox in this region, are, I believe, secretly and increasingly hostile to the Exclusive System. Their dissatisfaction with it, indeed, is becoming more and more manifest, in all directions. Not unfrequently do their sighs for better times, become audible. "Oh, that our ministers would exchange as heretofore, and let us live in good neighbourhood with our fellow Christians, as we used to do; we like not this unnatural state of things, and we will not bear it forever." I can confidently appeal to the feelings of multitudes of Orthodox Christians in this region, in support of my opinion, that Liberal Christianity is gaining in the respect and favor of the community.

'And even Unitarian views are spreading themselves in this region, silently and slowly, but steadily and surely. Unitarianism, using the word in an enlarged and proper sense, is, I am satisfied, from much observation and inquiry, gaining ground in this quarter.

'True—some ministers are becoming more Exclusive—in some towns there is an increase of the spirit of intolerance, and a proselyting, sectarian zeal is breaking up, here and there, a religious society. But these facts, when viewed in a proper light, are not against, but in favor of the opinion I have advanced above. It is a matter of course, that, as the stream increases in its swell, velocity, and power, its eddies should become proportionably violent, turbid, and noisy.

'The *new* [orthodox] societies in C——, A——, &c. do not increase upon the old, but rather the contrary. Attempts to render other towns Exclusive, fail, through the oppugnation of the people. Look to T——, and W——, and C——, who are endeavouring to settle Anti-Exclusionists. In B——, B——, W——, W——, S. A——, and T——, the Exclusive System has many invincible and weighty opposers. Indeed, I doubt not, the prediction of Dr Cumings, which he often repeated, will be verified, "*This plan* of *clerical domination*" said he, "*will never succeed.* The people *will* set the *ministers* right at last." My own people have been Unitarian for a half century.'

PLYMOUTH COUNTY.

'In this region Unitarianism had its origin, and the *spirit*, rather than the *letter*, has kept the even tenor of its way. They have disliked the "new divinity," which is Hopkinsianism, and would have quietly continued Arminians, believing that Christianity required nothing but piety and beneficence, had not new questions been agitated Since the controversies of the day, they have been affected as was to be expected. Those of warm and nervous temperaments have selected Methodism, and some few Calvinism, &c. The questions in debate, now are, whether Trinitarian or Unitarian sentiments are expressed in the bible? The majority of this region are decidedly Unitarian; and where there was a traditionary faith, there is now an intelligent examination and a well assured conviction.'

MAINE.—CUMBERLAND.

'In answer to your inquiry, I am happy to say, that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the cause of rational Christianity has never been more prosperous in my own immediate circle, than at the present moment. My own church has increased more than usual within the year. The congregation is full; and the Sunday School instruction is very numerously attended, and pursued with the best spirit and ardor, by as many as forty or fifty of both sexes, from among the most suitable and competent persons in the parish. An application has lately been made to me from S——, to obtain an assistant for Mr M——, who is settled in the First Congregational Society in that town. I have been able to attend to the request, and Mr W—— is now supplying the pulpit. I may labor under an erroneous impression, but I can entertain no other opinion, from the progress of knowledge and the character of the age, than that the cause of enlightened and liberal religion is destined to advance, if nothing be wanting in the prudence, good judgment, and devotedness of its friends.'

YORK COUNTY.

'I have received your favour, containing some queries relative to Unitarian Christianity in this region.

'With the increase of religious light, in this vicinity, the peculiarities of Calvinism seem to be every year fading from the public creed; and in the same proportion, I may add, are the principles of a more rational faith embraced. Orthodoxy, here, has small reason for that "confident and triumphant tone," to which you allude. At the same time, Unitarians, as a body, have as

little reason to boast of their wisdom or strength.

'Our fears, in Maine, do not arise from the machinations of the Exclusive System. They arise from our want of that unanimity or cooperation, which is so indispensable to success. We have materials here, for example, sufficient to compose three good parishes; a Trinitarian, a Unitarian, and a Methodist. These three would be numerous, strong, and prosperous; but when three or four more, an Episcopal, a Universalist, a Baptist, and a Catholic, are added to these, our strength becomes weakness, and our wisdom folly and infatuation. Most of these denominations, if not all, have more or less of Liberal Christians among them.

PENOBSCOT COUNTY, ME.

'I reside in one of the frontier towns of the State of Maine, where we have very little, if any, of what appears to me to be regular preaching. It is true that we have very many meetings for religious worship, but our preachers are illiterate, and unqualified to instruct in the momentous concerns of religion; and their tenets are anything rather than rational Christianity.

'There is no union of sentiment with us upon religious subjects, at present. The people are willing to hear any one who offers to teach them, and hence, it is my opinion, that a good field is here open for sowing the good seed. But we have not been in the habit of paying for preaching, and I apprehend that some time must elapse before we shall generally rid ourselves of our prejudices in that particular—I hope that we may eventually.

'The object of this communication, is, to inform you that the labors of Unitarian preachers of the right description, would be well received in this region, and would, I think, do much towards disseminating the true principles of Christianity. We have had an opportunity to witness, in a small degree, the effects of such labors. The Rev. Mr W——, of W——, spent three days in this vicinity, and preached once in this place, once in S——, and once in F——, both neighbouring towns, and, taking into consideration the very busy season of the year—we being in the midst of our haying—and that he spent no Sabbath with us, I may say that the meetings were well attended, and, so far as I am able to judge, his preaching very acceptable.

'If I understand the object of your society, it is to disseminate the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, and I have no hesitation in recommending this vicinity, as being a field, in which the seed might be advantageously scattered. But, Sir, suffer me to intimate, that I think a wrong estimate has been made by many, of the intelligence of the inhabitants of new countries. In fact, a great part of them are quite an enterprising portion of society, otherwise they would not have been situated as they are. I therefore would recommend that men of talents, men well acquainted with the nature of man, should be sent—if you send any. I know of no man better qualified than Mr W—— for a mission into this county. He made a strong impression. The people were very desirous to hear more from him, and I think that, could he have remained a few weeks with us, his meetings would have been very fully attended, and much prejudice against our belief would have been done away.'

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

'I can see nothing here to make me believe that Orthodoxy is gaining any increased ascendency. Our meetings are as fully attended as ever, although at least one third of our society, in consequence of the failure of business here, have left the place, and I know of no defection. The progress of truth never equals the hopes of the sanguine. But the progress of Liberal Christianity is in my opinion just such as should be expected, and just such as it ought to be for its own security. I should regret to see it spread by a perversion of feeling, as Orthodoxy sometimes does; for I should be sure there would be a reaction by which it would lose ground. It is on the calm good sense of the community, sustained by the observance of results, that the truths peculiar to Unitarianism must depend for their support. It may sometimes be stationary, sometimes even appear to retrograde, as the traveller finds levels and even vallies in ascending the highest mountains. But just so sure as the progress of the human mind is now advanced, is it certain that there is, on the whole, a continual advance towards the object of our wishes.

'I look upon all the pretended triumphs of Orthodoxy as hollow. Their pretensions to success, so far as their peculiar tenets are concerned, are in

the main, false. How very few in their congregations adopt the views which constitute Orthodoxy, you cannot but be sensible, and the increasing looseness with which their views are held and advocated cannot have escaped your notice.

'It is somewhat difficult to decide, when it is proper to separate and form a new society; and there are instances where the attempt has been premature. A large portion of those who think with you will be governed by considerations of expediency, and these are usually on the side of the old society. Unitarians are not fond of schism, and reason is always more lukewarm than superstition.

'When I consider that but a few years since Orthodoxy had possession of all the churches, and the control of the religious part of the community, and with what strength old religious associations entwine themselves about the heart, it seems to me but little short of a miracle, that Unitarianism, open and bold, has made such progress. As to the fear that free inquiry will be stifled, nothing can be more groundless. There may be some successful attempts at it, but it is only closing the shutters to darken a room instead of extinguish ing the sun.

'Nothing is so fatal to Orthodoxy as the exhibition of its spirit, and it now owes its popularity more to the circumstance of its being kept at bay by the Liberal, than to any other cause.

'You perceive, therefore, that my views of the subject are such, that if the boasted triumphs of the Orthodox were true, and even much greater than they are pretended to be, they would fill me with no alarm. For I hold that an acquaintance with Orthdoxy, either from experience or observation, is one of the best securities for Liberal Christianity. You will also perceive, that with these views, I may not be qualified to give minute details depending on occurrences that excite in me but little interest. Our cause rests on the principles of our nature and the general progress of the human mind—and these again are causes not under the control of Orthodoxy.'

VERMONT.

'With regard to Unitarianism in Vermont, I will begin first with my own society.—We were never so firm. Unitarianism in this place stands firmer than it has ever stood. The society has always been Liberal, from the very first, more than twenty years ago; nor has it been without its influence on this State. From inquiries which I have made the past year, I am fully satisfied, that there are many Unitarians in the State, and more now than there were two years since. One gentleman went so far as to say, that he did not believe there was a town, in which some could not be found—and these are (as it always has been) respectable and some of the first in their respective places. The Rev. Mr N———, formerly of W———, Mass., has resided some years in Vermont, and has occasionally preached, and he says, that everywhere, where he has made known his sentiments—which are decidedly Unitarian—he has found those, to whom they were acceptable. Many who would gladly hear Liberal preaching, do not know where to get it, or where to apply for it. Could a missionary pass through the State, he would find numerous hearers. Many tracts have been distributed, and wherever they have gone, they have been well received. I have had it said to me, and there are very many who say, "I do not know what I am—but I do know that I am not a Calvinist."—"Why, I have been a Unitarian years ago, but did not know it."'

PENNSYLVANIA AND OHIO.

[The following narrative was written at the request of the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association, and will be read with interest.]

'I travelled to see the face of the country—and to learn the state of society. Wherever I stopped for a few days or weeks, and became acquainted with those of Liberal sentiments, we of course had conversations on their prevalence and prospects. But of such conversations I took no note. I can furnish you nothing more, therefore, in the way of complying with your request, than to name the places where I preached, and to give you the general impression which I received.

'April 15th, 1827. Preached at H———, Penn. This society is admirably situated for the wide diffusion of Liberal sentiments. As the legislature has its sessions here, the more intelligent from the various parts of the State are brought together, and some

of them were already disposed to attend regularly, whenever they had a meeting, at the Unitarian church; while many others were willing to go and hear occasionally, that they might be able to judge for themselves. The society numbers among its members several active, intelligent, and zealous individuals, who give ample assurance, that no reasonable exertions will be wanting on their part, either to build up the society, or to diffuse what they believe to be the simple truths of the gospel.

'The evening of the eighteenth, preached in the courthouse at S———, two miles below N———. It was term time, and the court room was very well filled. Many, doubtless, came because they had no other way of passing the evening—but some, as I afterwards learned, that they might know what this 'new doctrine' was. After visiting that retired spot on the bank of the Susquehannah, where rest in quietness the remains of the venerated Priestley, I returned to H———, and preached again, the 22d.

'April 29th. Preached at P———, Penn. for Mr S———. The society, though few in numbers, are not without a laudable zeal for the sentiments which they hold. And if they could obtain a regular pastor, one who should devote himself wholly to the work, I believe a numerous and intelligent society might soon be collected in this rapidly increasing and beautifully situated city.

'May 4th. Landed at M——, Ohio, and left there on the 30th, having preached four Sabbaths. The services were in the courthouse, and the number of hearers from a hundred and fifty to two hundred. So desirous were the people in that vicinity to 'worship God in the way which some call heresy'—to hear 'the truth as it is in Jesus,' that some came twelve and even sixteen miles. During my sojourn in that delightful village, there was a meeting of an association of the Baptist denomination. As several of the preachers and many of the hearers came a great distance, it was continued from Friday until Monday; and some, who believed themselves Orthodox, and who had come many miles, for the purpose of hearing Orthodoxy, when they learned that a *Unitarian* was to preach on the Sabbath, had the independence and the christian candor to go and hear for themselves; and a few, at least, who did so, returned home with somewhat different views and feelings, from those with which they left.

'The 24th,—rode to B———, distant sixteen miles, where I had previously been requested to preach. And here, as at other places, I had reason to believe that the words of 'truth and soberness' fell upon good ground.

'After leaving M———, my next place of preaching was, the 5th of June, at L———, Kentucky. The services were in the Methodist church. Notwithstanding notice was given out but a short time previous, they were well attended.

June 6th. Left this beautiful forest city, (for so numerous are the trees in and about it, that, as you approach, it has more the appearance of a forest than of a town,) and arrived by the way of L——— at C———, on the 9th. As my labors were longer in this place than any other, I will give you a more detailed account of them. Being Saturday afternoon when I landed, and stormy withal, it was deemed inexpedient to preach the day following. Consequently, I had leisure to hear what others had to say,—and I improved it, by hearing Mr R——— and Mr J———. It was Trinity Sunday. So I had the beginning of Trinity in the forenoon and the ending of Trinity in the afternoon. In the morning, the preacher had so much the appearance of candor, as to acknowledge to his hearers, that the genuineness of the text 1 John, v, 7, was doubted by some Christians. But he was unwilling to give up, what he was conscious would be a good support to the doctrine of the Trinity, at least to the more ignorant portion of the community, so long as it retained its place in the New Testament. He therefore told his hearers, that after a careful examination of the subject, he saw no reason to doubt its being genuine, and in accordance with this conclusion, he urged it as one of the strongest props of his belief. In the afternoon, the preacher, either from ignorance or some other cause, did not even lisp to his people, that the said text had ever been doubted, but repeated it again and again in support of the all important doctrine.

'Mr R———, formerly a Methodist preacher, but some time since excluded from their fellowship, in consequence

of his independence in thinking and preaching, and who now has a sort of Independent Methodist society under his care, on being requested, readily granted me admission into his pulpit. Wednesday evening, therefore, June 18th, a general view of the belief and disbelief of Unitarians, was exhibited to an attentive audience of about one hundred and fifty persons. Immediately after the close of the services, the reverend gentleman in whose church I had been preaching, observed to the congregation, "*that a counterpart to the discourse just delivered would be preached in that place, next Sabbath morning, at the usual time of worship.*" As I did not preach the next Sabbath in the morning, I went and heard the "counterpart" to my sermon. I confess I was agreeably disappointed. To be sure Mr R——— did not seem to have a very extensive knowledge of biblical criticism, though, even in this department, he was not wholly a stranger—but he gave ample proof of having thought much on the subject, and that too with no ordinary powers of mind. Throughout the whole, there was exhibited so much of the spirit becoming a disciple of Jesus, as made me in love with the goodness of his heart, though I could not, in all respects, subscribe to the infallibility of his understanding.

'In the afternoon I preached in the New Jerusalem church, and as the Swedenborgian society held their services in the forenoon and evening, they, with much kindness and christian charity, which, from my partial acquaintance, I should think characteristic of the sect, granted the Unitarians the privilege of worshipping in their house when unoccupied by them. After this, our services were on Sabbath afternoon, and one evening of the week, the number usually attending being from one hundred and fifty to two hundred,—probably sometimes more than this number. You now have most of the incidents connected with my five weeks' preaching in C———.

'You ask me "What judgment I formed of things in that city?" I will tell you as briefly as possible. It is one of the most flourishing and rapidly increasing cities of our country. I give you one fact, that you may be enabled to judge of its trade. Between the 5th and 12th of February, 1827, twentyone steam boats, averaging two hundred tons each, arrived at and departed from this place; and at the time I left, there were judged to be over three hundred houses then building. Here then is a city numbering nearly twenty thousand inhabitants, carrying on extensive trade and manufactures, increasing with unparalleled rapidity; containing a medical college, where students from that and the neighbouring States, attend medical lectures—and having also within its bosom a college for the education of its young men, which, though not now in actual operation, will doubtless soon be revived under favorable auspices. Add to these things, that hundreds—I had almost said thousands—during the unhealthy season, come up from the 'lower country,' some to spend a week or two, and then to pass on to the North and East, and others to spend the summer in that enchanting city—and then you may form some idea of the importance of this place, for diffusing widely correct and enlightened views of Christianity.

'The materials for building up a Unitarian society in this place, I believe to be abundant and of good quality. The more enligbtened among the different sects are fast becoming at odds with the exclusive and horrible systems of Calvin and his would-be followers. And if a Unitarian church could be built and a pastor settled, there are good reasons to believe that the society would soon be, to say the least, as numerous and respectable as any in the city. The few who now acknowledge themselves Unitarians do not feel able to erect such a church as they think would be most advantageous to the growth of the society. They want assistance—and if any circumstances may be regarded as a claim, I should think theirs might be.

'You have asked my judgment in one thing,—permit me, in conclusion, to volunteer it in another. If a missionary go into the Western country, let him be well provided with tracts, that wherever he preaches he may sell them, or distribute them gratuitously. It is true you have depositories in that region, but they will go slowly from the booksellers' shelves, unless there is something to arouse the attention of the people to the subject. And when an extraordinary meeting is held in a city, and a stranger preaches,—and if, like Paul, when addressing the Athenians, he bring "certain strange things" to the ears of the attentive multitude—

it is then, if ever, that like Paul's auditors, they are desirous of knowing something more of this "new doctrine." And if the preacher have tracts, he would soon find himself surrounded with anxious inquirers after them.

'I have made these observations, because, wherever I preached, tracts were very much sought after. In every place there seemed to be a growing dissatisfaction with the religious sentiments generally preached. The people are getting tired of hearing changes rung on the sublime mysteries of the Westminster Catechism. They want something more simple and practical, something whose tendency is both to enlighten the understanding and to purify the heart, and we believe that the doctrines of Unitarianism, which are those of pure Christianity, are every way calculated to supply their wants, and to effect those all important purposes, for which they were designed by the Author and Finisher of our faith.'

Calcutta.—The following is an extract from a letter written by Mr Adam, the Unitarian Missionary at Calcutta.

'A salary of one hundred and fifty rupees per month is attached to the head teachership of Rammohun Roy's Anglo-Hindoo School, and he authorizes me to say that he holds it open for the acceptance of any Missionary who may be sent to Calcutta, and who may be competent and willing to aid me occasionally in English preaching, and in general Missionary duties. If he is a single man, he could live (and he could do no more than live with any tolerable degree of comfort and respectability) on three hundred rupees per month, and by this offer, therefore, you have one half of his salary already provided for. May I not hope that exertions will be made to obtain the remaining half, and that some one will be found to "come over and help us?"'

British and Foreign Unitarian Association.—[The following account of the Third Anniversary Meeting of this Society, which was held on Wednesday, the 28th of May, is abridged from the Monthly Repository for July last.]

'The religious services, at the Chapel in South Place, Finsbury, were attended by an unusually large congregation. The introductory and devotional services were conducted by the Rev. Dr Phillips of Sheffield; after which the Rev. Dr Hutton delivered a discourse from 1 Cor. iv. 4, 5.

'After service, C. Richmond, Esq. was called to the chair. The minutes of the last General Meeting were read by Dr Rees and confirmed.

'The Treasurer read the statement of the year's accounts of the Society.

'Mr Aspland, Mr Edgar Taylor, Mr Bowring, and Dr Rees, then read the Report of the Committee under its different heads.

'1. In what may be called the *Missionary* department, the Report detailed all the proceedings of the Committee during the past year, noticing the cheering results of the assistance given in the establishment of a Unitarian Congregation at Northampton, and various instances in which assistance had been afforded to other congregations.

'2. In the Civil Right department the Report details the flattering prospect which had presented itself of the subject of the claims for relief from the operation of the Marriage Act being effectively considered. The Report then congratulates the Dissenters generally on the successful result of the exertions of the United Committee for the abolition of the Sacramental Test.

'3. The Book Report detailed the progress of the usual business of that department.

'4. The Foreign Department comprised a great deal of interesting matter. The state of things in Calcutta and Madras furnished great ground for satisfaction, and the Report contained some valuable information as to the state of Unitarianism in America.

'5. Under the head of Miscellaneous Observations, the Committee suggested a direction to their successors to prepare and circulate a short abstract of the design, plan, and history of the Association. The Report then noticed the state of religious opinion in Ireland, and after paying a suitable tribute of respect to Dr Drummond, suggested that the Meeting should, by a vote, invite him to preach their next anniversary sermon; and also, that a visit should be undertaken to Ireland by some minister accredited to the mission by the Association.

'Resolutions on the subject of the abolition of the Sacramental Test, were proposed and passed, among which were the following;—

'"That no difference of religious opinions, however wide, can lessen the sensibility of this meeting to the liberal and generous support which they received, in the late application to Parliament, from the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom; and that common gratitude would compel them to make, in return, a tender of their best wishes on behalf of the claims of the Roman Catholics, for unrestricted and equal religious freedom, if they were not bound to aid, according to their means, the cause of these their fellow subjects and fellow Christians, by the still higher obligations of patriotism and religion,—believing, as they do, in the sincerity of their minds, that the existing disqualifications which aggrieve the British and Irish Roman Catholic population, are in open hostility to the peace and union and prosperity of the kingdom, and are, at the same time, a sure hindrance to the progress of the Protestant faith, and a violation of and dishonor to our common Christianity, which establishes no point of morality more plainly, nor commands any duty more solemnly, than that one Christian shall not make the condition of another more wretched or less happy on account of his faithful adherence to the dictates of his conscience and the law of his God."

'A much larger proportion than usual of the congregation remained to take part in the subsequent proceedings, and all expressed a strong feeling of interest and satisfaction in what passed.

'Upwards of two hundred and fifty friends to the Society sat down to dinner at the London Tavern, William Smith, Esq. M. P. in the Chair.

'The greatest harmony and good order prevailed throughout the evening, and the whole of the proceedings of this Anniversary were considered to exceed in interest any former occasion.'

Ordination at Hardwick.—The Rev. John M. Merrick was, on Wednesday, August 27th, ordained pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in Hardwick. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Clark, of Princeton; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Bartlett, of Marblehead; Ordaining Prayer by the Rev. Mr Thompson, of Barre; Charge by the Rev. Mr Bascom, of Ashby; Right Hand of Fellowship by the Rev. Mr Sewall, of Danvers; Address to the Society by Rev. Mr Wilson, of Petersham; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr Harding, of New Salem.

Ordination at Providence, R. I.—On Wednesday, September 10th, the Rev. Frederick A. Farley was ordained pastor of the Westminster Congregational Society in Providence, R. I. Introductory Prayer and Selections from Scripture by the Rev. Mr Greenwood, of Boston; Sermon by the Rev. Dr Channing, of Boston; Prayer of Ordination by the Rev. Dr Edes, of Providence; Charge by the Rev. Mr Parkman, of Boston; Right Hand of Fellowship by the Rev. Mr Gannett, of Boston; Address to the Society by the Rev. Mr May, of Brooklyn, Conn. Concluding Prayer by the Rev. Mr Walker, of Charlestown.

Dedication at Belgrade, Maine.—On Thursday, the 11th of October, a new church in Belgrade, Maine, was solemnly dedicated to the service of God. Introductory prayer by the Rev. Mr Farmer, of Cambridge; Reading of the Scriptures by the Rev. Mr Brimblecom, of Norridgwock; Dedicatory Prayer by the Rev. Mr Hutchins, of New Portland; Sermon by the Rev. Mr Wells, of Kennebunk; Address to the Society by the Rev. Mr Drew, of Augusta; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. Mr Brimblecom; Benediction by the Rev. Mr Hutchins.

Dedication at Raynham.—On Wednesday, October 15th, the new church, erected by the Second Congregational Society, in Raynham, was solemnly dedicated to the service of the only true God, through the only Mediator Jesus Christ. Selections from the Scriptures, by the Rev. Mr Goldsbury, of N. Bridgewater; Dedicatory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Clark, of Norton; Discourse, by the Rev. Mr Huntoon, of Canton; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Mr Hamilton, of Taunton.

OBITUARY.

DIED, at Cambridge, September 19, JOHN MELLEN, Esq. aged 76.

We should be guilty of injustice to the community, if we did not speak of the character of this honored friend. His life was an active and useful one, but was passed in the discharge of duties which did not extend themselves over a wide sphere of relations. His name, therefore, might not be familiar to many of our readers, if he had not spent his last years in a place in which, from the peculiar constitution of its society, his trials and virtues were brought under the notice of men from every part of our country. Few, who have resided in Cambridge of late years, have not carried away with them a respect for the sightless man, whose cheerfulness, courtesy, and instructive conversation were known by report even to those who did not enjoy the benefit of his acquaintance.

Mr Mellen was for some time the minister of Barnstable, a village of some importance below Plymouth, in this Commonwealth. Having received from his father, who was himself a clergyman in the interior of this State, the principles of a religious education, his mind was early and permanently interested in religion, and it was through life the subject of his most earnest and pleasant thoughts. The prolonged illness of Mrs Mellen, occasioned by her residence in Barnstable, and for whose restoration a removal into a different atmosphere was considered necessary, induced him to resign his connexion with a people, whom he had faithfully served, to whom he was strongly attached, and who never speak of him, at this distant day, but in terms of respect and affection. Domestic circumstances induced him to fix his abode at Cambridge, where his desire of usefulness and love of activity caused his influence to be felt in municipal concerns, as well as in the social circle. He was chosen to represent the town in the legislature; and other offices of trust to which he was elected, so long as his ability of active service continued, showed the confidence in his character with which he had inspired the minds of his fellow citizens.

But the providence of God called him to another and more painful exhibition of christian deportment. Blindness, that sorest of personal calamities, came upon him. 'The light of the body' was extinguished, the beautiful forms of nature were veiled in darkness, the countenances of friends were seen only through the eye of memory, the pages that breathed the spirit of divine and human wisdom were sealed from his vision, and the paths in which his feet had run to obey the calls of benevolence were to be trodden with a slow and cautious step, or no more entered. They who have not experienced the trial, cannot know what it is, to have all those avenues of communication with the outward world, which we enjoy through the sight, closed—to feel one's self dependent as an infant upon the watchful attentions of others, and to be turned at once from all that has interested and occupied the mind in visible life to the resources which the soul has accumulated in itself. The severity of this change Mr Mellen endured, and his conduct showed that he had not lived and looked on the works and word of God in vain. After using such means for the restoration of his sight as skill and prudence united in recommending, he relinquished the hope of resuming his former pursuits, and gathered up his thoughts for a cheerful submission to his lot. For years he dwelt in utter darkness. Through this period not a complaint was heard to escape his lips, nor did gloom settle on his countenance. Uniformly tranquil and happy, he shed a moral brightness over the domestic circle. He suffered as a Christian; a stranger would not have known that he suffered. He never spoke of his loss of sight, unless in obedience to the call of others, and then in tones which, while they expressed his sense of calamity, indicated an entire resignation to the Divine will. His mind seemed to be even more active than before his blindness. The knowledge which he had laid up in former years was now an inexhaustible fund, from which he brought the materials for new processes of thought, and the aids to a constant moral improvement. The truths, and to a wonderful extent, the words even, of the New Testament were engraven on his memory, and its spirit had long

been cherished in his heart. The evident pleasure with which he listened, and the judicious criticism of his remarks, converted the office of reading aloud into a privilege, and he never wanted friends who were glad to avail themselves of such an opportunity of doing and of acquiring good. He was thus enabled to maintain an acquaintance with the current literature, and with the theological writings of the day. In the latter, he took a deep interest, and observed the progress of religious opinions with a dispassionate but attentive mind. His own belief in regard to the great topics in discussion was distinct and firm, and was the result of those exercises to which he had been accustomed, through a long course of religious thought and experience. He had never been a pupil of the Calvinistic school, nor ever regarded Christ as equal with the Father who sent him. During the many hours of meditation, which constituted a blessing rather than a trial consequent on his exclusion from active employment, he pursued his inquiries after truth. His friends saw in him a remarkable instance of one, who, in the decline of life, was untouched by the control of prejudice, and whose mind was willing to receive, and anxious to obtain, light on every subject connected with the christian faith. His mind was in the highest sense liberal; candid in its judgments, and tender to the infirmities of others, but honest in its scrutiny, and open to every true conviction. The consequence was, that he advanced with advancing truth. Ethical subjects had for him peculiar attractions, and he studied them, as they are best studied, in his own heart, and under the teaching of Christianity.

It need not be said, that the society of such a man was delightful to all who knew him. The unbroken tranquillity of his soul, the holy contentment of his spirit, and the rich stores of his intellect, gave to his conversation an irresistible charm. It was a privilege, for which we could not but be grateful to Him who gives us the good examples of his servants, to witness the silent life of such a Christian. It was yet a higher blessing, to listen,

> ——'While the voice
> Discoursed of natural and moral truth
> With eloquence, and such authentic power,
> That in his presence humbler knowledge stood
> Abashed, and tender pity overawed.'

The testimony which such excellence bears to the efficacy of a simple faith, is valuable. Mr Mellen was a Unitarian, an avowed and consistent Unitarian. In this faith he lived; in this faith he endured, for years, one of the greatest privations, without repining, and without losing the energy of his mind; in this faith he anticipated the approach of death, during a severe illness, when neither fear nor rapture possessed his soul, but in a calm reliance on the mercy of God, and in a hope of eternal life, drawn from the gospel of Jesus Christ, he appeared as a servant waiting for his master's coming; in this faith he died. Of him, if of any one, may we not believe, that he has passed into that world, where there shall be no darkness, where the righteous shall forever behold the works and glory of God, and where the soul that, amidst the trials and sufferings of the present state, pursued its researches after truth and goodness, shall be enabled to maintain an everlasting progress towards perfection,—that world, which is emphatically light.

In his will, Mr Mellen remembered the people of his early charge, and the church, to which he had distributed the memorials of Christ. He left directions, that a valuable addition should be made to the service of the communion table at Barnstable, thus desiring, as it were, in his last thoughts, to associate the friends and duties of his ministry, with the expectations of an immortal life.

CORRECTION.

On page 396, we find, on review, that we mistook the meaning of a passage adduced from Augustin in our article on the Calvinistic Doctrine of Infant Damnation. We gave the passage in proof that he believed in the damnation of some *baptized infants*, when his meaning simply is, that God does not immediately take all such infants out of this world into heaven, but permits them to grow up, and prove apostates, and *then* consigns them to hell. The error does not at all affect the question of Augustin's belief in the damnation of *unbaptized* infants, all of whom he gave up to eternal burnings, as is abundantly evident from our other quotations.

Erratum.—On p. 342, near the bottom of the first column, for תגם read תגם.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. V.—No. VI.

NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1828.

MISCELLANY.

ON THE MEANING OF THE EXPRESSIONS, 'EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT,' AND 'LIFE ETERNAL,' IN MATTHEW XXV. 46.—'THESE SHALL GO AWAY INTO EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT, BUT THE RIGHTEOUS INTO LIFE ETERNAL.'

MANY commentators interpret the whole passage of which this text makes a part, as being a continuation of the same prediction, contained in the twentyfourth chapter of this Gospel, which is, evidently, a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the overthrow of the Jewish nation.

That 'the coming of the Son of Man,' in his power and glory, does, in many places, signify the manifestation of divine wrath upon Judah and Jerusalem, when the measure of their crimes should be full, there can be no doubt. The overwhelming desolation of the nation which persecuted and crucified Christ, seems to have been intended as a remarkable manifestation of the wrath of God against them; and at the same time, a magnificent testimony of the truth and divine origin of the christian religion. It is something which spoke to that age, something which is now witnessing to us, and something which will be testifying to all ages, that God has honored, exalted, and glorified that Jesus, whom the people of that nation, in blindness and malice, crucified and slew.

Nevertheless, the particular meaning of a mode of expression in one place, or in one connexion, is not proof positive that it means the same in all cases. Every scriptural mode of expression must be considered with reference to the circumstances and connexions in which we find it, and in view of the modifications and differences of signification, which these things point out.

Now the passage under consideration, beginning at the thirty-first verse of this chapter, 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory,' &c., and ending with the special words of our subject, 'These shall go away,' &c., is confessedly one of the most sublime, and, to the true Christian, one of the most exhilarating of any in the scriptures. We cannot persuade ourselves that it is confined in its meaning to the mere destruction of Jerusalem. Our Lord, evidently to us, begins a new subject, when he begins this part of his discourse. He has already said what he had to say upon the destruction of Jerusalem, the outward desolation of the outward things, appertaining to the external state of that people; and leaving this, he goes on to speak of things appertaining to the *spiritual* state of the human being, and describes the judgment of the *soul*, with its searchings, its terrors, and its effects; and its peculiar descent with power, into the heart and conscience of every individual.

'Before him shall be gathered all nations.' We do not apprehend, that our Saviour intended, in any particular descriptions given in this passage, to mark out the exact mode, or outward form of the judgment of the soul. The truth is, that the resurrection, the last day, and the judgment to come, are described in the scriptures, under so many different modes of speech, and are exhibited under so many different forms of expression, that, if we receive these statements literally, we should make almost as many different outward forms of the judgment, as there are occasions on which that event is alluded to in the scriptures At one time, for instance, there would be immense thrones to be built, and books opened, and the record of each one's life read over; and we should be 'judged out of the books.' At another time, we should see the Son of Man, first separating the good from the wicked; afterwards telling over to each one his own particular good or evil, and then assigning his lot accordingly. Then again we should have the good caught up suddenly 'to meet the Lord in the air.' And yet again, we should simply see 'the mortal, putting on immortality, and the corruptible, incorruption.' And then also, we should have some of the

dead coming to judgment at one time, and some at another; one resurrection now, and another at the end of a thousand years; and so many things of this kind, in many cases inconsistent with each other, that we are compelled to believe that none of these modes of expression were designed literally to set forth any exact mode or form of the resurrection, or the judgment. They are merely different ways of announcing the same thing, without intending exactly to describe it. But they all concur to prove one truth; viz. that there is a deep, severe, and searching judgment for souls to pass through; and that every individual must endure it, each in his own person. 'We shall, every one,' in some way, 'give an account of ourselves to God.' Our own views upon this subject, we can state in few words; and we shall now endeavour to do it, with all plainness and simplicity.

In our view, then, all judgment of souls is of a spiritual, or inward nature. There is no outward mode or form to it. Judgment is something which takes place in each one's own soul; in every person's inward thoughts and feelings, under the influence of God upon the individual mind; and the outward universe has no further concern with our individual judgment, than as what is taking place in our thoughts and feelings may be manifested openly; either mediately, through our words and actions, or immediately, by the spiritual discernment of spirits, 'seeing as seen, and knowing as known.'

This inward judgment takes place in the individual person, *whenever* God is revealed to that soul in his true character, and when his searching presence is really perceived by the spirit of the man; as truly, though not to the same extent, in this world as in the world to come. It is then that we see our sins, glaring in the light of the Almighty's countenance, with the tremendous retribution they deserve. And then, too, on the other hand, we see holiness, shining in the same all pervading brightness; and as our states of mind are, either good or evil, godly or ungodly, so do we experience either the peace of penitence, the conscious remission of sins, and the heartfelt satisfaction of unity with God; or contrariwise, painful disquietude, anguish of mind, remorse and horror, and fear that cometh like desolation. In one or the other of these states, we have, to a greater or less degree, an experience on the one hand of that 'eternal life' which visits the soul that, 'by patient continuance in well doing, seeks for glory, and honor, and immortality;' on the other, the 'indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,' which rack the heart of the 'contentious and disobedi-

ent,' the lover and follower of unrighteousness, the soul which 'striveth with its Maker.'

This spiritual judgment takes place, in a measure, and perhaps very often, in human hearts, in the present world. There are few, if any, who do not in some degree realize the coming of God to the soul; experience, therein, their individual amount of inward judgment, and receive the consequence according to their individual states of mind; experiencing happiness if at unity with God, disquietude, if at variance with him.

This spiritual judgment takes place in the fulness of its power and efficiency, when the human being passes away from all material connexions, and goes forth a simple spirit; naked, unshielded, and exposed. Then God, the Eternal Mind, pervades it searchingly throughout, makes manifest its most secret thoughts and feelings, and fills the whole man with his own presence; so that then, the wicked soul, realizing instantly, and perpetually, the direct presence of the Holy One, and being at heart unpenitent, unreconciled, and conscious of unforgiven sin, experiences dismay, anguish, and horror, which he cannot escape, because he cannot escape from God, with whom he maintaines a selfish and disquieting warfare. 'Whither shall I go from thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence?' On the contrary the good soul, in the same state of spiritual expansion, experiences the same constant perception and impression of the Deity; but reconciled to God, submissive to his sovereignty, and at unity with him, the divine presence and spirit shed on his heart, the anointing of the oil of gladness, a sense of rest, a peace which passeth understanding, a joy unspeakable and full of glory. 'In thy presence, there is fulness of joy.'

'The last day,' therefore, spoken of in the scriptures, we conceive to be the last day of each individual's mortal life. Death, as the extinction of being, or even as a state of unconsciousness or inaction, is abolished, and immediate 'life and immortality are brought to light.' The resurrection is the instant event, by which man, as soon as he passes from the body, enters the undisguised presence of God; experiencing happiness or wretchedness, according to the habits of thought and affection which his earthly courses, 'the things done in his body,' have engrafted into his soul.

These views of the nature and effects of judgment, we have deemed it necessary to state, in order to explain our thoughts concerning the meaning of the expressions 'eternal life,' and 'everlasting punishment,' in Matth. xxv. 46, the passage under immediate consideration. The Greek word in both cases, it is

well known, is the same, [αιωνιος,] and is indifferently translated, either 'eternal' or 'everlasting.'

It seems that there are no less than ten different significations attached to the term αιων, in the scriptures, and about the same number, of course, to the word αιωνιος, its adjective. It would be both tedious and useless to enumerate them all in the present discussion. It may be sufficient to observe, that they are words which do not necessarily imply duration at all, either temporal or eternal. They as often express the nature, or state of a thing, as they do its duration; and when expressing duration, they do not necessarily imply eternity.

They sometimes refer to *ancient things;* as in Romans xvi. 25. 'The mystery which was kept secret in *past ages.*' [χρονοις αιωνιοις,]—Common Version, 'since the world began.'

They sometimes express the *long continuance* of a thing which the event has shown to be temporary; as in Exodus xl. 15, where, speaking of the sons of Aaron, it is said, 'Their anointing shall surely be an *everlasting* priesthood;' [εις τον αιωνα.] The phrase, εις τον αιωνα, in this place, is commonly understood to signify *long duration;* but we are inclined to think it signifies the Mosaic *dispensation;* in which case the everlasting priesthood promised to Aaron and his sons, was a priesthood *throughout that dispensation.* At all events it was not strictly eternal, for it ceased at the coming of the great High Priest.

Numbers xxv. 13, it is said of Phinehas, in relation to the priesthood, 'He shall have it and his seed after him, even the covenant of an *everlasting* priesthood;' [διαθηκην ιερατευειν αιωνια.] The 'covenant of an everlasting priesthood,' or 'everlasting covenant of priesthood,' in this place, most certainly does not mean a strictly eternal priesthood, but one that should endure a *long time,* or to the end of the then established *dispensation.*

Genesis xvii. 13, of the ordinance of circumcision it is written, 'My covenant shall be in your flesh for an *everlasting* covenant;' [διαθηκη αιωνιος.] But who will pretend, that circumcision was prescribed as an *eternal* witness of man's relationship to God?

The words sometimes refer to *an age, a dispensation,* or *order of things;* sometimes to *the men existing in any particular age;* and have many other significations of a similar kind.

But among all the texts quoted by Schleusner in his long articles upon the words αιων and αιωνιος, we do not see any, in which they must necessarily signify *positive eternity.* Indeed, he asserts as follows; 'If I rightly remember, neither αιων, nor αιωνιος, anywhere in the New Testament, denotes *absolute eternity,* or *duration without beginning and end.*' There are several

places indeed, in which they probably do imply endless duration; but there are many, in which it is certain they do not.

From what has been said we infer, that the mere use of the word αιωνιος, in Matth. xxv. 46, does not necessarily imply the positive eternity, either of the happiness of the good, or the misery of the wicked after judgment. However true the doctrine of an immediately and unalterably eternal state of the soul, after the judgment, which takes place at the death and resurrection of the individual, may be, still the mere use of this word in this place does not prove it.

It is, however, of immense importance, to ascertain what this expression does mean; it being a perilous thing on the one hand, to exhibit any doctrine in such a light, as to encourage sinners in hardening themselves in impenitence; and it is, at the same time, being unfaithful to the truth, to exhibit the christian religion in a more harsh or rigid point of view, than the inspiration of God justifies.

Now there is one meaning of the word αιωνιος, which is seldom noticed by critical writers; and whenever we have named it, or heard it named, we have commonly seen it met with so much *repellency* of mind, that we have but little hope of its being received, when we exhibit it again. Nevertheless it shows itself so often, to our mind, in the New Testament, and bears with so much weight on our own views of the passage under consideration, that we shall now set it forth, and leave our readers to receive or reject it, as it approves, or disapproves itself to their minds.

We observe then, that the most important meaning, which, we think, belongs to this word in the scriptures, more especially in the New Testament, is that which is expressed better by the English word *spiritual*, than any other. This meaning, there is good reason to believe, was a very ancient, if not the original meaning of the word. It is well known, that ancient philosophers believed in a class of beings, called αιωνες, or æons; which were said to be, either mediately or immediately, derivations from the supreme Divinity, and were entirely spiritual existences. They were all, originally, good; but some of them had become wicked; and so the whole class answered to the common modern ideas of angels, on the one hand, and devils on the other; or generally, to what we mean by the word *spirits*, be they good or evil. The one set were happy, the other unhappy; but the happiness or unhappiness was wholly of a spiritual nature, consisting essentially in the state of each individual's thoughts and feelings, either in union with, or in opposition to the Divine Mind. These beings, as we have remarked, were

called æons, and the word αιωνιος, the adjective of this name, very naturally expresses something having the nature of æons; in other words, something *spiritual*, in its kind, be its duration longer or shorter. . It signifies something of that nature which specially belongs to spirits; designating the kind, or nature of the thing; and showing forth something relating to the inward thoughts and feelings in the individual, without precisely marking the period of its continuance; the Greek word αιων, answering to our word *spirit*, and αιωνιος, to *spiritual*.*

Now if we can find evidence that this meaning does actually, in some passages of scripture, belong to this word, it will go far towards illustrating the text under consideration. And to our minds there are many places, in which the word αιωνιος does evidently signify simply *spiritual*, without reference to duration. It means something belonging peculiarly to the thoughts and feelings; the inward spiritual state of the person, be its continuance longer or shorter. A few of these places will now be named.

1 John v. 11 and 12. 'God hath given to us eternal life, [ζωην αιωνιον,] and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.' 'Eternal life,' in this place, must be something which the Christian possesses now; 'God hath' already 'given it to us.' It means something which the Christian obtains by embracing Christ; 'this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath life.' It means something which the unbeliever does not possess; 'he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life.' 'Eternal life,' in this place, cannot mean perpetual existence, since that is the common property both of believers and unbelievers. It cannot signify something to be inherited only in another world; for they have it now. And in fact we know not what this expression in this place can signify, unless it be religion dwelling in the heart, in power, satisfaction, and hope; in other words, a happy and energetic state of thoughts and feelings, in conscious unity with God, *a spiritual life*. This is what the true Christian does possess now; varying to be sure in measure, in different individuals, but still in some measure belonging to every Christian; and it is what the unbeliever does not possess. Vital godliness is perhaps the only thing which is not common to the Christian, and the unbeliever. This inward state of thought and affection, is 'that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto

* Schleusner, in his article Αιων, in order to show the meaning of the word among Greek writers, quotes from Epictetus the following passage; 'Ου γαρ ειμι αιων, αλλ' ανθρωπος,' which he translates, 'I am not by nature immortal.' A more literal translation would be, 'I am not an æon, but a man.'

us.' It is 'in the Son; he that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son hath not life.'

1 John, iii. 15,—'Ye know that no murderer hath *eternal life*, [ζωην αιωνιον] abiding in him.' In other words, no murderer hath *true religion*, *vital goodness*, *spiritual life*, abiding in him. The expression cannot well mean anything else.

John, v. 24. 'He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, *hath everlasting life*, [ζωην αιωνιον] and shall not come into condemnation, but *is passed* from death unto life.' In this place, our Lord plainly speaks of '*everlasting life*,' as the present possession of the Christian, and as being his security against future condemnation. Now the peculiar present possession of the Christian, is wholly of a *spiritual*, or inward nature; consisting essentially in those christian habits of thought and affection, which God imparts to him through his faith in Jesus Christ; and it is the possessing this fixed condition of the soul, which saves him from coming into condemnation. This inward, heavenly region of thought and feeling, is, therefore, the *eternal* or *spiritual life*, into which the true believer is *already* passed. 'The kingdom of God is within you.'

In our Lord's peculiar manner of speaking, the word 'life' often signifies power, peace, and enjoyment; as when he says, Luke, xii. 15, 'A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth,' he undoubtedly means to show, that a man's life, in respect to its real and enduring value, consists, essentially, in the power, peace, and satisfaction, which he receives and possesses. And inasmuch as all true satisfaction of mind depends on the state of the thoughts and affections in relation to God, therefore he refers to these things of the soul as riches 'towards God.'

In the same point of view he affirms true acquaintance with God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, to be in itself *eternal* or *spiritual life*; 'this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' And as all true heavenly thoughts and affections come into the heart through faith in him, he therefore asserts and repeats the sentiment often in different forms; 'He that believeth on me, hath everlasting life;' John, vi. 47. He *hath it now*, through his faith; even the spirit, power, and satisfaction of true religion. 'Whosoever drinketh of the water which I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, *shall be in him*, a well of water, springing up into *everlasting*,' or *spiritual*, 'life;' John, iv. 14. This passage, however highly metaphorical, needs no comment. This he undoubtedly spake

of the *spirit* which they that believed on him should receive. In allusion to the thoughts and feelings which he came to impart to the minds of his disciples, he called himself 'the living bread which came down from heaven;' and then soon remarked, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *hath eternal life*, [ζωην αιωνιον] and I will raise him up at the last day.' Truly he who receives into his own soul, the thoughts and feelings of the great Master, does possess a *spiritual life*, and at his last day shall be raised up.

Indeed, there are but few places in the New Testament, where the Greek word αιωνιος is used, and is translated by the word 'eternal,' or 'everlasting,' in which it may not be as well translated by the English word *spiritual*, and make good meaning. The only place which now occurs to us, in which such a rendering appears inconsistent, is Hebrews ix. 14. 'Who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself up,' &c. Now, in this place, the term 'Eternal Spirit,' undoubtedly signifies the same thing as the Holy Ghost elsewhere; and believing, as we do, the Holy Ghost to signify the Divine Energy, producing power and holiness in man, we see no inconsistency in reading this passage according to the views we are attempting to exhibit, thus; 'Who, through a spiritual Divine Energy, offered himself without spot.'

Leaving this here, we might name many texts, in which the use of the word *spiritual*, instead of *eternal* or *everlasting*, evidently adds clearness and force to the expression, and in which we believe it ought to have been so rendered; as—

Hebrews, vi. 2. 'Eternal judgment,' is named as one of the foundations, or first principles of the christian religion. 'Spiritual judgment,' would, we think, have much better expressed the mind of the writer; inasmuch as a judgment, taking place in the soul, is one of the essential things which sinful man must endure, before he will repent, and be reconciled to God. And as a spiritual judgment in the world to come, is also one of the leading doctrines of Christianity, this is, therefore, one of the foundations of which the apostle is speaking in this place. But 'eternal judgment,' would seem to imply that the soul should be perpetually arraigned at the bar of God, and would be eternally being judged.

2 Thess. ii. 16. 'God hath given us *everlasting* consolation and good hope through grace.' *Spiritual* consolation, consolation in the thoughts and affections, is surely the meaning of the apostle here.

Hebrews v. 9. 'Being made perfect, he became the author

of *eternal salvation*, to all them that obey him.' Now salvation is altogether of a spiritual nature; it really consists in the emancipation of the soul from error, corruption, sin, misery, and alienation from God, and reducing it to a state of truth, purity, holiness, and happiness, in conscious unity with God, whether this alteration in the condition of the soul be gradual or instantaneous. And of this *spiritual* salvation, Christ Jesus 'became the author, to all them that obey him;' or, if the mode of expression seem better, he established a religion, which produces a *salvation of the mind*, in all those who cordially embrace and follow it. The christian religion, from its inward, spiritual nature, is eminently called, 'the dispensation of the *spirit*.' And 'the kingdom of God within you,' is in effect that 'eternal,' or spiritual, 'redemption,' which Christ hath obtained for us by the shedding of 'his own blood.' It is an inward, spiritual power, whereby the 'conscience is purged from dead works, to serve the living God,' spiritually, and truly. And that 'eternal life,' which, in the world to come, shall be given to those who here forsake much for religion's sake; it surely means a state of spiritual happiness, a condition of the soul, expanded, powerful, and joyful in the divine presence.

When God is said, in 1 Peter v. 10, to have already called Christians 'unto his *eternal* glory by Christ Jesus,' we think the apostle must have meant, that God had called them to share in *his own mind*, and dwell in fellowship with his own *spirit*. Indeed, we cannot conceive of a more exalted or more durable glory, than that of a soul which is made a partaker in any way of the mind and spirit of the Supreme Divinity. His home, his 'dwelling place,' is an immense and infinite region of holy mind, in which he may expand and extend himself for ever and ever, and still be met, sustained, and blessed by the same gracious and all-sufficient One, who first called him into this spiritual glory by Jesus Christ; and to introduce our souls to this bright and glorious region of mind, seems to have been the great object of our Lord and Master when he 'gave himself a ransom for many,' and 'suffered for us, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God.' 'The glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.' John xvii. 22, 23.

Admit for the moment, that the term αιωνιος signifies a *spiritual* thing, without special reference to its duration; and then we have a key to many passages of scripture, otherwise obscure and mystical. Take even our Lord's advice, in the parable of the unjust steward, Luke xvi. 9. 'Make to yourselves friends of

the mammon of unrighteousness, that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations,' [αιωνιους σκηνας,] and it means this;—Use your outward, worldly things, things not specially religious, in such a manner, that, when ye fail of finding satisfaction in them, ye may have a refuge in your own thoughts and feelings towards God, and heavenly things; may be received into *spiritual* resting places, 'everlasting habitations.' So true it is, that 'it is the spirit which quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.'

This meaning of the word αιωνιος we believe to have been in the mind of our Lord, when he uttered the words now under consideration, as well as on many other occasions.

With this meaning in our minds, turn to the portion of scripture beginning at Math. xxv. 31, and continued to the end of the chapter, and the whole passage sets forth these thoughts; viz. 'There shall be a judgment, in and upon every human soul. When it takes place, the wicked, the unconfessing, the unreconciled to God, shall pass into anguish, disquietude, and horror; *a wretched condition of mind*, in conscious enmity with God—spiritual suffering, [κολασιν αιωνιον] but the righteous into peace, power, and happiness, in conscious unity with God—*spiritual* life, [ζωην αιωνιον.]' The mere use of the word αιωνιον, in either clause of the verse, neither asserts nor denies, that the felicity of the one, or the wretchedness of the other, shall be either perpetual, or temporary. This we believe to be the true import of the passage, and what our Lord Jesus intended herein to teach.

In this interpretation, we are further supported, by the use of the word κολασιν, in this place, for describing the misery of the wicked. This word is used but once only, in the New Testament, excepting in the passage which we are considering; that is, 1 John iv. 18. 'Perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment [κολασιν.].' The torment of fear, is undoubtedly suffering of mind. The word *life*, on the contrary, signifies happiness of mind; and the text might, with equal justice to the original, have been translated, 'These shall pass into *spiritual anguish*, and the righteous, into *spiritual felicity*.'

Now, with regard to the abstract question, whether these contradistinguished states of happiness and misery, shall continue *eternally*, it depends entirely on the question, whether the several states of goodness or wickedness in the individuals shall continue eternally. Happiness or misery of mind, must continue as long as these states of the soul endure, in beings always exposed to the searching presence of God. And, whether these opposite states of the soul in individuals, shall endure forever,

after that judgment which they go through, when they forsake the flesh and are 'present with the Lord,' is a point which it would be presumptuous to decide, until it shall be given to imperfect beings to fathom the depth, and measure the extent of that Divine Love, which seeks, convinces, and converts souls; and saves them in free grace, by 'the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.'

Still, in regard to the possibility of a change of character after the human being shall have emerged from its earthy envelopements, and become wholly spiritual, we will go so far as to say, that spiritual beings *have* changed their character once, when angels fell; and we see not, why they may not change again. And if they do turn cordially back, and become reconciled to their great Sovereign, they must be happy, independent of outward place or circumstance. We must also remark, however, that when sin, in any mode, becomes deeply wrought into the soul, and becomes, as it were, a part of the very affections of the man, then it seems almost impossible to eradicate it entirely. Spiritual wickedness, appears to possess a kind of unchangeableness, like the leopard's spots, and the Ethiopian's skin. But then, there is a power, which is able to wash out the darkness of the one, and change the variegated hues of the other. That same power is able to convert the sinner, in the darkest regions of hell, as well as at the altar of God, or in the christian church. But we do not read any explicit promise, that such conversions shall take place in the world to come, and we can gather no further hope of it, than what springs from this;—that inasmuch as death is abolished, and life and immortality are brought to light, we may contemplate human souls as everlasting existences; and then the same God, who exerts his influence over them so powerfully in this life, notwithstanding the many causes, which hinder, as one may say, his access to their hearts, *may*, for aught which is written to the contrary, exert that influence upon them with much more power, in a world, where they shall be more directly exposed to the immediate impressions of Him who is unwilling to give them up, till, discerning God on every side, and constantly experiencing the disquietudes of rebellion against him, they may at last surrender, and repent, and be converted to God; submit themselves to his service and will, and seek his good spirit; and if they do this, they must be happy and blessed.

While, therefore, on the one side, we read no explicit promise, that such a change *shall* take place in the future state; so neither, on the other, do we read any positive assertion

that it shall not. As we cannot find a warrant for maintaining the absolute certainty of the restoration of all men, at some period of their perpetual existence, to God and goodness; so, contrariwise, we cannot find positive evidence that sin and misery, the one of which God hates, and in the other of which 'he takes no pleasure,' shall endure in human souls for ever and ever. Knowing, however, that it is not in our power to love the creatures of God so well as he loves them, we are content to leave them, and ourselves among the number, to his disposal in the spiritual, as in the natural world.

This also we know, that 'it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,' at any time, or in any manner—to be taken captive for judgment, and retribution; and that there are some expressions in the scriptures, which denote a period of long enduring and intense spiritual anguish to the impenitent, when condemned at the throne of God, though we see no positive assertions whether that period be temporary or perpetual. Knowing, therefore, the terrors of the Lord, but not knowing to what extent either of power or duration they shall reach, we desire to persuade men, and move ourselves, to be reconciled to him, and serve him in the gospel of his dear Son, while it is an accepted time, and a day of salvation; trusting it to himself to accomplish, in his own way and at his own time, the prediction revealed by his inspiration, that Christ must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet, and then deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all. G—n.

REVIEW.

Art. XIII.—1. *The Works of Samuel Parr, LL. D. with Memoirs of his Life and Writings, and a Selection from his Correspondence.* By John Johnstone, M. D. *Fellow of the Royal Society*, &c. 8 vols. 8vo. London. 1828.

2. *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Opinions of the Rev. Samuel Parr, LL. D. with Biographical Notices of many of his Friends, Pupils, and Cotemporaries.* By the Rev. William Field. 2 vols. 8vo. London. 1828.

Of the first volume of these Memoirs by Mr Field, some notice has already appeared in our pages;* and the wish that was then expressed, for an ampler account of the private life

* See Christian Examiner, Vol. V. No. 2.

and habits of the celebrated personage to whom they relate, is fully gratified in the volumes before us.

The life of Dr Parr is indeed of no ordinary interest to scholars and theologians. He was one of the last survivors of a race, whose names and whose writings have been familiar to our early youth; the associate or cotemporary of Johnson and Burke, of Bennett and Porson, of Sheridan and Fox, of Watson and Sir William Jones; and his extensive correspondence through a long life, connected him, nearly or remotely, with most of the distinguished names in church and state, among his own countrymen, of the last half century. His celebrity as a classical scholar, his ability and success as an instructer of youth, his fidelity as a village priest, and his ardent love of liberty, civil and religious, amidst his passionate fondness for establishments, are the points on which his admirers love to dwell. That he had the power also, with all his faults, of inspiring strong personal regards, is evident from the numerous affectionate tributes, that have been offered to his memory Of the copious memoirs, whose titles we have affixed to this article, the one is from the pen of a Dissenting clergymen, near Warwick, who was for thirty years his neighbour and friend; the other by an eminent physician, in Birmingham, who, by a still longer, and, it would seem, a confidential intimacy with him, was well qualified for the work. For he tells us;—

'I can appeal to my own recollection, and my own personal knowledge, for such an account, as shall best display him in those different points of view in which it is most useful to contemplate character—in the full vigor of manhood and in the hoary holiness of age, at home and abroad, in public and in private, in the hours of business and of conviviality, in the bosom of his family and employed with his pupils, or when he was showing the force of his understanding in public instruction, or in some of the freaks of his humor, among his familiars.'—'For thirtyfive years I have seen him in numberless varieties of our imperfect condition.'—'We have travelled together the wearisome road of life in narrow circumstances, and in abundance.' *Johnstone's Memoirs*, pp. 7, 8.

Dr Parr was born at Harrow, in 1747; and before he had completed his fourteenth year, was the head boy of that celebrated school. Of his childhood, his only sister, at the desire of his biographer, wrote an account, part of which we shall transcribe, not only as it presents at a very early period some of the distinguishing traits of Parr's character, especially his love of power; but as it may remind not a few of our readers of a similar account, from a kindred source, of the earliest years of our lamented Buckminster, who, though happily differing from Parr in many great particulars, strongly resembled him in his

early predilection for his profession, and in his passionate attachment for classical literature.*

'My brother might be styled slovenly in his dress. I do not recollect that he entered much into the usual sports of boys. He was from childhood of a studious turn of mind, but with me he was playful, though, I must confess, at times, rather obstreperous, as he would approach me with clenched fists, though in perfect good humor.'—'His earliest study and longest cherished delight, next to Mother Goose, was the history of the Seven Champions of Christendom. From the age of nine or ten, he evinced a strong inclination for the clerical profession; insomuch, that he was accustomed, when our cousins from Eton were with us during their vacations, (they, together with myself, forming the congregation,) to read the Church Service, (after the due tolling of a bell tied to the banisters, by those who officiated as clerk,) and sometimes he preached, and we youngsters often thought him prolix enough. He made one sermon for Christmas day, *when under twelve years of age*, which was shown to the vicar of Harrow, who said it was so good and appropriate a composition, that no clergyman need have been ashamed to deliver it. He substituted for a surplice a shirt of my father's, taken from the press. This reaching the ears of Mr Saunders, the vicar, he had a gown and cassock made for him, with which my brother was highly delighted. So enwrapped was he in his predilection, as even (notwithstanding my father's remonstrances,) to persist in reading the burial service over dead birds, kittens, &c. Another of his amusements was bell-ringing.'—'*He always assumed authority among his playmates at home, making his cousins call him uncle.* He was, I think, between twelve and thirteen, when, together with Sir William Jones and Dr Bennett, bishop of Cloyne, he wrote and acted a play.'—'Sam was the darling of his mother, and her death, which happened in 1762, was severely and lastingly felt. She was indeed but too indulgent to him; every wish and whim was attended to, and his appetite so consulted, as to have hot meat suppers prepared for him from early childhood.'—

'He finished his school education under Dr Sumner. The doctor was very partial to him, had the highest opinion of his abilities, and always said that Parr would wear lawn sleeves.' *Johnstone*, pp. 16—20.'

It seems to have been his father's intention to have educated him at home for his own profession, as a physician; but his love of ecclesiastical pomp, his gravity of temper, and fondness for religious services, accompanied, as they were, with unfeigned piety, overruled his father's wishes, and he became a student of Emanuel College, Cambridge, in 1765.

At the University he was distinguished by his incessant application and his exemplary obedience to the discipline of the college. But the death of his father, and other domestic sorrows, which he was soon called to experience, left him poor, and he was glad to avail himself of the offer of his friend and patron, Dr Sumner, to become his first assistant in Harrow school. It was in this celebrated academy, that he commenced his labors as an instructer of youth, in which, at Stanmore,

* See Life of Buckminster, prefixed to his Sermons.

Norwich, and Hatton, whither he successively removed, he obtained distinguished reputation and spent the greater portion of his life.

Dr Parr never attained to high promotion in the church. To this his well known liberality on all questions of religion and government, and his great boldness of utterance, were insuperable obstacles. He lived for thirtynine years, and died, in the comparatively obscure condition of curate of Hatton; and though, like his correspondent, Bishop Watson, whom in many points of opinion and character he greatly resembled, he sought great things for himself, and was perfectly satisfied that he deserved them, yet the dispensers of ecclesiastical power could never be persuaded to entrust much to a man, who not only thought as he pleased, but fearlessly declared what he thought. The prebend of St Paul's, for which he was indebted to the kindness of Bishop Lowth, was indeed, for the few last years of his life, a source of independence and affluence. But in its earlier periods, Parr, in common with multitudes of illustrious men, was no stranger to perplexities and straits. He suffered a severe disappointment in the failure of his election to the head mastership at Harrow, to which he had many claims, and where he had ably served as an assistant; and in opening a new establishment for himself at Stanmore, whither, we are told, he went without a penny, he writes to a friend, 'how impossible it was to describe the anguish of his *honest and ingenuous mind*, when he had been forcibly driven away from the place where he had drawn his first breath, in which he had formed the most endearing connexions, and in which he had faithfully discharged the most important duties.' Yet such, even at this time, was the confidence in his integrity, that a friend voluntarily loaned him two thousand pounds, which, after several years, was faithfully repaid. Dr Parr retained through life the deepest sense of this kindness; and on the paper enclosing his bond for this obligation, is written, 'My account with my benefactor, very sacred, and to be most carefully preserved.'

We love to dwell on such incidents; for we count it one of the best uses of biography to record the struggles of eminent men in their progress to usefulness and fame; to show us how their strongest and noblest virtues may have sprung out of their adversity; and that a career, which, regarded only in its results, would seem to the world triumphant, may have been commenced in obscurity and poverty, and perhaps for years and years have been pursued amidst mortifications, discouragements and straits.

As a village pastor and a parish priest, the character of Dr Parr may be contemplated with great satisfaction. He had lofty conceptions of the dignity and the duties of his office; and his love of authority not seldom betrayed itself in his familiar and friendly intercourse. But both his biographers agree in presenting him in the most amiable light as the friend and brother, the patron and father of his flock. His long residence among them made him perfectly acquainted with their characters and wants; and the poorest and the humblest were encouraged freely to come to him, that he might impart to them, as their circumstances required, of his counsel or protection, his sympathy or his purse. We happen to have heard some touching anecdotes of this kind from an occasional visiter at his parsonage.

'From the beginning to the end,' says Dr Johnstone, 'he was generally on the best terms with all his parishioners. He visited them all; he attended their clubs; he went into their cottages, and smoked his pipe with the meanest of them.'—'His manner of instructing them was affectionate and familiar, and well adapted to the meanest capacity. He explained as he went along; and if any particular occurrence in regard to morals or discipline, had taken place during the week, he was sure to notice it.'—'In the more atrocious cases *he even mentioned the parties by name*, and always designated them and the fault that had been committed, in such a way that the picture could not fail of being recognized.' pp. 828, 829.

His celebrity as a preacher frequently attracted strangers from Warwick and the neighbouring watering-place to his church; and we remember hearing from one of his delighted auditors, that after the service, while his people were waiting in their pews for their minister, as was formerly the custom in our churches in New England, he would slowly pass down the aisle, cordially shaking hands with those whom he could reach, and kindly inquiring for those of their families whom he perceived to be absent.

'It may be said with truth,' remarks Mr Field, 'that never was the liturgy of the church read with more exact propriety, or with more impressive energy, than by the officiating minister of Hatton. The most careless hearer could scarcely fail to be roused to attention, and struck with awe, when, with his majestic air, his devout looks, his deep and solemn tones, he repeated such admirable prayers as the confession, the general supplication, and the general thanksgiving; or when he recitee that beautiful and animated, though not wholly unexceptionable form, thd litany; or when, from the communion table, he delivered the decalogue, with a voice which seemed to speak his sense of that high and holy authority, under which it was originally promulgated.'—Vol. ii. p. 327.

Those, however, who judge of pastoral integrity only by the

standard prescribed by the usage and opinions of our own country, will be surprised to learn, that—

'Except on particular occasions, Dr Parr seldom wrote sermons, or delivered those of his own composition from the pulpit. His usual method of preaching was, to read select passages from the printed sermons of eminent divines; of whom his favorites were Barrow, Clark, Balguy, Pierce, Jortin, among those of the English Church; and, [let it be taken for a token of his liberality,] *Fawcett*, *Rees*, G. Walker, and Zollikoffer, members of other churches. But, in the course of his reading, he always introduced his own observations; which not unfrequently, indeed, formed the largest portion of the whole; and from the justness and value of the thought, from the felicity and energy of the expression, and from the solemn earnestness of the delivery, these unpremeditated observations never failed to fix on the hearers the most powerful impressions.'—'It was his custom to comment on the lesson, or the collect, of the day; and his explanatory remarks were always instructive to the highest, and usually intelligible to the lowest, of his hearers. If, indeed, a clerical friend happened to be present, he would occasionally [as he seldom sought, or accepted assistance in the services,] introduce critical observations, with this notice,—that *they were intended, not for the congregation generally, but for his learned brother in particular, by whom only, he would add, they could be fully understood.*'—*Field*, vol. ii. pp. 330 and 327.

It was a singular circumstance, that the rector and the curate of Hatton, on the great controverted points of theology, held opinions diametrically opposite. The annual visitations therefore, and the sermons for a month, which, by law, were required to be delivered by the rector, who was of the Evangelical school, were the sources of much uneasiness and vexation to his curate, who willingly would have been subject to no one. On these occasions, we are told that Dr Parr generally contrived to be absent, or, if at home, he never attended the services of the church. But, fearful for his charge, lest they should receive another gospel, and like Sir Roger de Coverly, who was landlord to the whole congregation and not willing that any should go wrong but himself, on resuming his public duties, upon the departure of the rector, he frequently addressed his people to the following effect;—'My dear parishioners! if, during my absence, any dark, abstruse, unintelligible notions of religion have been *held up to your view*—think of them no more—forget them—reject them!'

This characteristic anecdote, with all its strangeness and indecorum, is justly adduced by his Dissenting biographer, as one among the thousand proofs, that the Church of England, in aiming to establish uniformity, even on important points, attempts an impossibility. Can anything indeed exhibit in a more convincing light, the absolute futility of all such efforts? Here are two clergymen, colleagues as we should call them, fellow laborers at

least in the same field, who have voluntarily become the spiritual guides of the same flock, subscribed the same articles, professed allegiance to the same ecclesiastical authority, and deriving, moreover, their livings from the same source, absolutely at points on the great subjects of their faith and preaching, the one seizing the earliest opportunity he could find, to warn his people, and that publicly, against the errors of the other. The articles of the Church of England have been called by Paley and other moderate defenders, 'articles of peace;' by which, if anything, must be meant, that under a general assent and abstinence from direct opposition, there may exist wide diversities of belief. But the example of Parr, and of others that might be mentioned, shows us, that not even peace is secured. And when, notwithstanding the high veneration and praise which are due to the illustrious names, both of past and present days, of which that church can triumphantly boast—the learning, piety, and zeal, which would have graced the company of the apostles—we still see such opposition in its professed teachers, and find the most conflicting doctrines inculcated from the same pulpits, the conviction is clear and inevitable, that there is no power—nay, that there is not even a tendency, in articles and subscriptions, to produce uniformity of faith. Nor is this the greatest evil. Who can doubt that a solemn assent to a creed not believed, must impair the integrity of conscience, and weaken the moral principle? That many great and excellent men have submitted to this yoke, is no evidence that it is not grievous, or that it may not be safe; and we are only left to lament the process, by which such men as Clarke, Law, Paley, Watson, Parr, and a numerous host of wise and good, laymen as well as clergy, can approve for others, and vindicate for themselves, a course, which, after all that can be conceded to venerable usage, illustrious examples, liberal interpretation, and public acquiescence, is still the testifying to what is not true, and a solemn declaration of what is not believed.

The advice of Dr Paley to an anxious father, who had solicited his counsel respecting the conscientious scruples of his son on the subject of subscription, is familiar to many of our readers. Under the pretence of satisfying the original intention of the legislature, who imposed the subscription, we find that excellent writer contending for a latitude, or a secret reservation, as to articles *absolutely disbelieved*, irreconcilable, at least, if not revolting, to an unsophisticated conscience. But the strongest illustration of what we intend, appears in the following letter of Dr Bennett, the Bishop of Cloyne, the cherished friend

of Dr Parr, and certainly one of the purest, most enlightened, and exemplary prelates that ever adorned the English Church. Yet who can read without compassion and surprise, the wretched sophistry it would recommend? What stronger evidence can be adduced, of the corrupting influence of all such requirements, even upon the noblest and purest minds? 'And what,' inquires Mr Field, '—must be thought of the law, requiring subscription to numerous, unintelligible, inexplicable articles,' that need these miserable evasions? The letter is addressed to that eminent scholar, but unfortunate politician, Gilbert Wakefield.

'You have doubts on the subject of our articles; and where is the man who has not? At least, I should have a very bad opinion of the sense and the heart of the man who has not. And do you really think that every man who subscribes, is guilty of perjury, but the very few who understand them literally? Perjury perhaps is too harsh a term; subscribing that a thing is true, being very different to swearing to the truth of it. But you, at least, think us guilty of gross prevarication; and here remains the difficulty, whether you think the possession of the comforts, and what some think the honors of life, worth such a prevarication, or not? This, my dear Wakefield, you only can determine. "*Fecerunt alii et multi et boni.*" But, I own, authority is a very bad argument against conscience. If it were not, I would mention, in particular, your fellow collegian, Jortin. He professed himself a doubter about the trinity, yet he subscribed repeatedly. I do not see why we need scrupulously inquire, in what sense the articles were originally, or are now imposed. If I can make the declaration, that I believe them to be true—take the word truth as you please—I have done enough; but I fear I shock you,' &c. &c.—*Field*, vol. ii. pp. 292, 293.

It was the opinion of Dr Parr, that 'the propriety of continuing in the church, when conscientious scruples exist in the mind, will depend upon personal circumstances, which must be different with different men, and upon general principles, about which the best scholars, and the best Christians, are not wholly agreed.' In his own case, he was undoubtedly aided by the force of early attachments and a fondness for ecclesiastical parade, which, as we believe he has somewhere confessed, might, under other influences, have carried him back to the Church of Rome. He delighted strangely in the gown and the cassoc, the church bells and the painted windows, and in all the pomp of the cathedral service, and he would gladly have seated himself on an Episcopal throne. But notwithstanding this, he was the devoted friend of civil and religious liberty. He contended nobly for the rights of conscience. He exposed on all occasions the weakness and the misery of an intolerant spirit. He was the friend and patron of every measure suited to diffuse

light and knowledge among the poorest and most dependent classes of the community. There was no feature in his character more prominent, than his truly christian candor. 'Seldom, or never, perhaps,' says his excellent biographer, Mr Field, 'has this celestial virtue appeared upon earth in a purer spirit, or under a more engaging form. There was here, not only the absence, but the utter abhorrence of bigotry; there was not only the presence, but the glowing warmth, the stirring and active life, of christian charity. With the strongest conviction of his understanding, Dr Parr adopted it as a first and a great principle, that the sincere and virtuous of all religious creeds are equally the objects of divine favor, and have equally a right to challenge approbation from men. Far from resting, therefore, in the mere negative merit of thinking no ill of those of different persuasions, he felt for them the same kind and respectful regards, as for those of his own; and disdaining to admit coldly the good intentions, or to acknowledge faintly or reluctantly the talents or the merits, of those opposed to him in opinion, his generous and ardent mind sprang forward, with eager delight, to claim for them all the justice, or to demand for them all the praise, to which they might seem to him entitled.'

This magnanimous spirit, so gratefully celebrated by his friend—himself an honored object of it—was indeed the glory of Parr. It was in him a beautiful union of 'power and of love and of a sound mind.' It drew from him his celebrated tribute to Priestley, when to praise Priestley was to incur public suspicion, as well as theological reproach. It made him the advocate of Dissenters in the presence of mitred bigots, whom he hated, and of intolerant statesmen, whom, though he longed for a bishopric at their hands, he would neither flatter nor fear. It was in this spirit, that he addressed a remonstrance to Archbishop Magee, upon the publication of a Charge, in which, among other evidences of a narrow temper, that learned, but exclusive dignitary, had opprobriously designated Unitarians as *illiterate*.

'*Hatton, Sept.* 25, [1823.]

'My Lord,—Though differing widely from your Grace upon some important subjects of controversial theology, I hold, and therefore always shall avow, a very high opinion of your talents and attainments. With much pleasure have I read two of the Charges, which your Grace has lately published.'—'But, with surprise and with concern, I observed that in one of them your Grace has spoken sweepingly of the Unitarians as illiterate. The expression, my Lord, astonished me.'—

'Now, my Lord, I know nothing either by report, or my own reading, about the number of Unitarians in Ireland, or their writings, or their erudition, or their want of erudition. I at the same time am justified in say-

ing, that among my own learned acquaintance in this country there is not one teacher in the established church whom I could safely pronounce an Unitarian. Without the pale of that church, indeed, there are several Unitarians, with whom I think it an honor to be acquainted, and I shall make no apology for introducing into this letter their names, and avowing the sincere respect which I feel for their intellectual powers, their literary attainments, and their moral worth. Let us look round a little, my Lord. Will any scholar apply the word "illiterate" to Grotius, to Curcellæus, to Susius, or to Le Clerc? These are the distinguished Unitarians of former days. I have not been a slovenly reader of the Fratres Poloni, and I could mention the names of several persons, whose tenets seem to me erroneous, but whom I should not dare to call illiterate. In the last century lived Dr Lardner, Dr John Jebb, Mr John Baynes, of Trinity College, Cambridge, the friend of Sir Samuel Romilly, and an academic, distinguished in his day for his proficiency in science, and his skill in classical learning. Perhaps Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle, may, without injustice, be supposed to look upon Unitarianism rather with a favorable eye towards the close of a studious life. Was Bishop Law illiterate? Was Dr John Taylor, of Norwich, illiterate? And slender as might be the pretences of Dr Priestley and Theophilus Lindsay to any critical accuracy in the languages, or to any delicate taste of the elegancies of profane authors, Greek and Latin, yet their attention to scriptural Greek, though it did not preserve them from what you think heresy, was more than sufficient to protect them from the application of illiterate. Was the late Duke of Grafton illiterate? Were the writers of the Free and Candid Disquisitions illiterate? I was not personally acquainted with the late Mr Cappe, of York, but his writings furnish abundant proofs of eloquence, acuteness, and, I add, erudition. Was Encedinus illiterate? Is Wegsheider illiterate? Was Semler illiterate? Is Eichorn illiterate? Let me not pass by some dissenting clergymen, who are avowedly Unitarians, and upon whose claims to be considered as scholars, I can speak, and therefore do speak, with confidence.' &c. &c.—*Johnstone*, pp. 672—674.

After enumerating with special honor, many individuals still living, among whom are Cogan, Roberts of Manchester, Shepherd of Liverpool, Berry, Belsham, and Yates, he proceeds;—

'Your Grace will do me the justice to observe, that I mean not directly or indirectly to defend the heretical opinions, adopted by any of the worthies whom I have enumerated. But I should say of them, whether I adverted to them in the senate, or from the pulpit, or from the press,—yes, my Lord, I should say in the hearing of all the conclaves, and all the convocations in Christendom, "*Utinam essent nostri.*" I hope therefore, my Lord, and, if you were not an Archbishop, I should advise that in some future edition of your excellent Charge, you would withdraw the word illiterate. There are many other points, upon which your sagacity, learning, and eloquence, may be employed with the greatest propriety, and far better effect.' *Ibid.* p. 675.

The religious opinions of Dr Parr were the natural results of his bold and ingenuous spirit. From early impressions and long cherished associations, he was, it is true, a faithful son of the church in which he was educated. He adhered to her

ritual, was a scrupulous and pompous observer of all her rites, and read on the appointed festivals, the Athanasian creed. But he had his own way of interpreting her articles. He rejected with abhorrence the revolting doctrines of Calvinism, though he seldom made the topics of controverted theology the subjects of his public instructions. 'His notions of the Deity,' says Dr Johnstone, 'were lofty and noble.—He never mentioned the name of God, without lowly reverence. The moral government of the world and the order of the universe were the medium, through which he contemplated the Creator. In that moral government he saw the goodness of a paternal Deity demonstrated, and in that order his omnipotent wisdom.'

From Mr Field we learn, that Dr Parr held the divine unity in the strictest sense, though under the modification or disguise of Sabellianism—the very form in which that doctrine was held by Hooker and Burnett, by Baxter and South. He absolutely rejected the representations, which have so long passed in the world under the name of Orthodoxy, expressed in the terms original sin, hereditary depravity, arbitrary election, and eternal reprobation. He abstained from the use of the word 'atonement,' maintaining, that, in its modern acceptation, it was not a scriptural term, and that the common doctrine of expiatory and vicarious suffering, to appease divine wrath, was utterly irreconcilable with any tolerable notions of the divine perfections, and with the clear doctrine of the christian revelation. He believed, that on the part of the Great Creator, no disposition to be reconciled to the truly penitent, was wanting; that he was placable in his own nature; and that it was the end of the christian scheme, and especially of the death of its great Author, to reconcile men to God, to lead them to repentance and reformation. With regard to the future life, he believed, that there were different degrees of future rewards and punishments, proportioned to the merits or demerits of every individual; and he agreed with Bishop Newton, Dr Hartley, and many others, that future punishments are *corrective;* intended to produce moral reformation in the sufferer, and to prepare, ultimately, for the gradual attainment of greater or less degrees of happiness.

We have exhibited a brief view of Dr Parr's opinions, from the extended survey, presented, with evident candor and fidelity, by one who was qualified to state them, but who seems to acknowledge, that, on the topics of controversial theology, his friend would occasionally throw over his opinions a veil of mystery, so as to leave it doubtful what they really were. Indeed, a strange love of secrecy, even upon unimportant subjects, ap-

pears to have been one of the foibles of the doctor. He would have delighted in the pomp and silence of the Eleusinian mysteries; and though he often thundered out his decisions with the authority of an oracle, or like Jupiter with his shaking locks, Mr Field relates, that in his private conversations upon religious questions, he would sometimes, 'with an air of overstrained solemnity,—desire him to lock the door of the apartment in which they were sitting, that no sudden intruder might overhear their conversation on those deep subjects, as he termed them, and, perhaps, misconceive, or misrepresent it.'

The domestic history of such a man as Parr cannot but be interesting. It may be easily inferred from what has already been seen of him, that his character and habits in this regard, were peculiar and not without fault. In his various relations as husband, father, and friend, he was in general affectionate and kind; but he was not seldom too, capricious, petulant, and severe. Nor were his arbitrary expectations and commands confined to his servants and children. His friends and equals were sometimes grieved or silenced by his dogmatical assertions, or by the ebullitions of his wrath. His first marriage, which was one of convenience, did not, from contrariety of temper, contribute to his happiness. His second, though contracted at an advanced age, he regarded as his great temporal felicity. It was his lot to experience a large share of domestic sorrow, and the successive deaths of all his children—three promising daughters, to whom he was tenderly attached, and especially of the eldest, whose fine genius and talents he delighted to cherish,—filled his heart and his dwelling with sorrow. Nor was he without his sufferings from other sources of domestic trouble, which probably he sustained with the less composure, as they must have been, in part, the consequences of his own infelicities of temper. But let us hear his biographer.

'In domestic life, Parr was too great a scholar, and too studious a man, to be the exact favorite of the drawing room. All was to yield to his wishes, all was to be regulated by his habits. The ladies were obliged to bear his tobacco, or to give up his company; and at Hatton, now and then, he was the tyrant of the fireside. But he was so good humored in his disposition, and was so easily led by kindness, that the cloud never lasted long, and the thunder was soon succeeded by sunshine and by calm. At table he has been called an Epicurean glutton. In society he has often been denominated a bear, and his moroseness, and impracticability, and severity, were the terror of many weak and effeminate spirits. It is not true that he was a glutton. He only loved a good dinner, as all healthy men with good appetites, and many studious men without them, love it.'—'His pipe was so necessary to his comfort, that he always left the table for it, and the house of the person he visited, if it was not prepared.'—'To the lady

of the house, though a ceremonious, Dr Parr was sometimes a troublesome guest. When he was thwarted or attacked, or in company of those he disliked or suspected, he certainly had the power of being most exquisitely disagreeable.'—*Johnstone*, pp. 812—816.

Of all this his biographer honestly relates some tremendous illustrations. But with these great faults, which sometimes made even his nearest friends tremble, there were noble qualities, that commanded their devoted affection and faithful service. Parr was affectionate, generous, and humane. He delighted in the society of his friends; and, in the days of his affluence, and even of his straits, he made them his frequent and happy guests. He was unwearied in his kindness to his parishioners; and the poorest man in Hatton, or the poorest wanderer through it never applied to him in vain. His humanity extended to the inferior creatures. He was fond of his domestic animals, and like Cowper, he gave protection to the hares which sometimes resorted to his garden.*

Nor was this beautiful trait conspicuous only within his parish or his household. His sympathy and benevolence were extended far and wide; and did our limits permit we would lay before our readers some touching examples of his effective kindness in favor of many, who neither by their characters nor connexions, could urge any claims to his regards. To the prison of Warwick, though not an inhabitant of the town, he was a frequent visitor; and by his counsels, tenderness, and charity, revived the hearts of many poor wretches, who were deserted of all others; who saw 'that the world was not their friend, nor the world's law.' Particularly did the condition of those, who, by the tremendous severity of the English criminal code, were appointed to death, lie heavy on his pitying heart. He composed a form of prayer, which, as their day approached, he always offered for them, in his own church at Hatton; and in instances detailed with great interest by his biographers, through his earnest and prevailing interposition, he was the happy instrument of rescuing from an ignominious death, two individuals, one of whom had been a respectable clergyman of the Establishment.

Nor did he hesitate to express his compassion for another, if possible still more unhappy class of sufferers, whose peculiar wretchedness it is, to be given up, at once, to the neglect and indignation of the world; from whom not only the priest and the Levite, but the Samaritan also, thinks he must turn away; and who, it may be believed, amidst many a pang of penitence, and an overwhelming sense of their degradation, not seldom go down

* Field, vol. ii. pp. 388, 389.

to their early graves unpitied and unprayed for. It is in endeavouring to excite some charity in favor of such, that we find in his admirable Discourse on Education the following passages. As they are the only extracts we can make from his works, we present them, not only for the christian benevolence they would inspire, but as examples of his vigorous and classic eloquence. Nor can we conceive that, to the reflecting mind, the slightest apology could have been needed, either for the subject itself, or the spirit in which it is treated.

'While I view the lowering clouds of calamities which gather from various quarters, and burst unexpectedly upon the heads of many dependent and defenceless women, often does there rush into my mind that pathetic language which an ancient writer thus puts into the mouth of a most affectionate and most afflicted father:

'"My sons are men, and, wheresoever fortune
May place them, cannot want the means of life.
They shall not burthen you—but, oh! my friends!
What shall become of my unhappy daughters,
With tenderest care beneath a father's hand
Cherished so long?—Oh! take them to thy arms,
Thou best of men!"—

'In the anguish of Œdipus every feeling heart must sympathize, when it reflects on the helpless state of females; and in ages yet unborn it will redound to the honor of many worthy persons among ourselves, to have undertaken that merciful and momentous task which Creon was called upon to perform.'—

'In other cities, the prostitute may find a refuge. We rejoice as Christians and as men, that it is possible for her to find it.'—'Others remedy, but we prevent. And what, my brethren, are the enormities and the calamities, thus prevented? The loss of innocence and reputation. The most inveterate habits of laziness and vice—the torments and loathsomeness of disease—the inability to escape from the taunts of monsters by whom they are first betrayed and then insulted—the forfeiture of protection from the world's law—the despair of receiving one transient look of compassion, one solitary offer of succour, one tribute of a passing sigh, which the heart at the sight of woe involuntarily sends up to heaven—of receiving them, I say, not merely from the churlish and venomous misanthrope, or the reserved and fastidious matron, or the unthinking and unfeeling youth of either sex—but even from those sweet and gentle natures, whose tears, on other occasions, gush out abundantly, at the first view, nay, at the bare recital of much blacker crimes, accompanied by much lighter woe.'—

'This part of my subject is so extremely interesting in itself, it is so closely connected with the best effects of our institution, and it has taken such fast hold of my attention, that I will, without reserve, and without apology, open to you the most secret and most sacred sentiments of my bosom. Partly from the solicitude I have ever felt, to preserve those, who are entrusted to my care from rushing incautiously toward the brink of temptation, and partly from the habits I have contracted, of intense and solemn meditation on the awful constitution of the moral world, it has been my wish, and perhaps it is my lot, to have gained some little insight into the most hidden springs and the most intricate channels of that guilt and misery, which in the young, we have occasion so frequently, and so feelingly to deplore. To the hard, very hard situation of these wretches—

but why do I call them so? They have not had the same virtuous education with you, and with myself—but they have the same understanding—the same feelings, the same Redeemer, and the same Creator. I will correct myself and say, to the hard situation of these poor women, I often bend my sad and serious thoughts; nor do I ever suffer myself to speak of them, not merely with the outrageous and undistinguishing barbarity of vulgar minds, but even with that severity, which is thought by some well-meaning persons a necessary tribute to the cause of religion. When I recollect the wiles that are practised against them, the infamy with which they are branded, the little share many of them have in bringing down destruction upon themselves, and the little pains, that are taken by the very world, which condemns them for being corrupted, to preserve them from corruption, believe me, brethren, my fortitude and my piety have sometimes forsaken me, and in the first perturbation and anguish of my soul, I have been tempted to say, "Why hast thou made them thus?" But from these gloomy and tempestuous thoughts, which drive us on to "charge God foolishly," a good man quickly recovers with "fear and trembling;" and then he quietly passes into this wiser and better train of reflection. What they are, they have been made, not by their God, but by themselves and their fellow creatures; by the excessive wickedness of those who seduce, and, in part, even by the excessive and mistaken piety of those who censure them.'—

'Even the just abhorrence of a Christian should be mingled with tenderness, and corrected by comprehensive views of circumstantial palliation, where it is to be found. We should recollect that they who are now tainted by the last dregs of pollution were once spotless; that, goaded by perpetual indignities from the vilest and the lowest herd, they have gradually become callous to all shame; that, being abandoned by others, they at last despaired of themselves; and that, unaccustomed to meet with favor, which might soften, or with counsel, which might reclaim them, they lost the power of valuing, with the expectation of receiving, either favor or counsel.'—'I am not speaking to you in a strain of ostentatious and empty declamation—I am not terrifying you or myself with the spectres of a gloomy imagination—I am not calling upon you to lavish your sympathy upon representations of fictitious misery—No. I am only desiring you to open your eyes to calamities which really exist, and many of which it is really in your power to prevent. How many unhappy beings, not "trained up in the way they should go," are at this moment pining with famine, shivering with cold, and wasting away under the slow depredations of disease, without any habitation in which they can lay their guilty heads; without a spiritual director to admonish them, and pour balm into their aching hearts; without external succour to support them in the last lingering remains of life; and without one reflection from within, that can assuage the terrors of impending death!'—*Works*, vol. ii. pp. 266—272.

Of Dr Parr's personal habits, appearance, and manners in his closing days, we select from his biography the following picture, which, from its graphic delineation, can hardly fail to amuse our readers.

'It is pleasing to dwell on the closing period of Dr Parr's life, when after "having endured very irksome toil and suffered very galling need," for many years, he found himself placed, [by a remarkable change in the value of his prebend of St Paul's,] in a state of ease and affluence. He had now

the ample means of exercising that generous hospitality, in which he delighted, and of indulging freely the benevolent luxury of relieving the wants of others.'—'He rose early even in his old age; and throwing carelessly round him his clothes, which were not uncommonly of uncouth shape and coarse texture, and not unfrequently well worn and well patched, with his head enveloped in a night cap, he sat down in his library and employed himself in reading, writing, or dictating to others. Here, in the midst of his learned labors, he was often found by his morning visitors, to whom he seldom refused admittance; and whom he scrupled not to receive, attired as he was, totally unconcerned about his own grotesque appearance, and in truth hardly conscious of it. It was his habit, almost immediately on rising, to call for his pipe, with which he welcomed the morn, and cheered the studious hours of the day, as well as animated the social or the solitary evening.'—'After a studious morning, Dr Parr usually took his only exercise, which was gentle riding on horseback, enlivened by a few friendly calls on more distant neighbours. He had no inclination for any of the sports of hunting, shooting, or fishing; nor had he the least taste for gardening or agriculture. His corporeal frame was robust and vigorous; but he had not sufficient agility to enjoy much the pleasures of walking. Though, during his latter years, he kept his coach, *and sometimes went in it, with a kind of state, of which he was sufficiently vain, drawn by four horses,* yet almost to the last, he generally preferred riding on horseback. He was often to be seen, on the road from Hatton to Warwick, or from that town to Leamington, moving slowly along, the most grotesque figure imaginable, wrapped in an old blue cloak, with coarse worsted stockings, and one rusty spur; his head covered with a huge cauliflower wig, and a small cocked hat, overtopping all; his servant preceding him about a dozen yards, either on foot or horseback.'—

'Dr Parr's nature was highly social; and he almost always spent his evenings in the company of his family and his domestic visitors, or in that of some neighbouring friends. He was fond of the pleasures of the table; and probably, in the course of the whole year, few days passed, in which he did not meet some social party, round the festive board, either at home or abroad. At such times, his dress was in complete contrast with the costume of the morning; for he appeared in a well powdered wig, and always wore his band and cassock. On extraordinary occasions, he was arrayed in a full dress suit of black velvet, of the cut of the old times, when his appearance was imposing and dignified.

'After dinner, but not often till the ladies were about to retire, he claimed in all companies his privilege of smoking, as a right not to be disputed; since he said, it was a condition, "no pipe, no Parr," previously known and peremptorily imposed on all, who desired his acquaintance.'—'Of the Duke of Sussex, [who cherished him for his attachment to Whig principles,] and in whose mansion he was not unfrequently a visitor, he used to tell with exulting pleasure, that his Royal Highness not only allowed him to smoke, but smoked with him. He often represented it as an instance of the homage which rank and beauty delight to pay to talents and learning, that ladies of the highest stations condescended to the office of lighting his pipe.'—*Field*, vol. ii. pp. 107—115.

'In society, where he chose to display himself, he neither was, nor could be equalled.'—'It was in his cheerful hour when, in the society of men and women he respected, or who looked up to him for improvement; when his spirits were calm, his temper unruffled; when the atmosphere around him was genial and placid; when no one dogmatised, or dictated, or contradicted, or uttered sentiments derogatory

from truth; in the society of those, whom he did not suspect, his mind, grave and collected, then showed the amplitude of its power, and his heart the depth of his goodness. He would then pour forth the stores of his understanding in language pure as that of Plato, and utter truths worthy of Socrates.'—'Then would he display the intrinsic worth of his character; his deep and devoted piety, his unsullied purity of mind, his probity, his integrity, his mighty intellect, his unrivalled accomplishments, his supreme command over language—then like an angel would he instruct. Often and often have I, at such times, listened to him with rapture, and caught eagerly every syllable that passed from his lips; and as long as I live, or at least as long as I have reason, I believe, that no hour will pass over my head, in which I cannot trace from recollection or association, some advantage derived from his precepts, his writings, or his conversation.'—*Johnstone*, pp. 818—820.

Dr Parr lived to a venerable old age. His death took place in March, 1825, after he had entered his seventyninth year. Through a protracted and painful sickness he maintained an admirable tranquillity and sweetness of spirit. 'More perfect composure of mind,' said his attending physician, 'more entire submission to a higher will, less anxious attention to self, and more kind concern for others, on a dying bed, I have never seen. His farewell to his family breathed the goodness and gentleness of his soul, and the manner in which it was uttered, was such, that a seer of Israel could hardly have made it more impressive. He endeavoured to make his deathbed a scene of instruction and moral recollection.' Having called around him his wife, his grandchildren, and servants, he confessed to them his weaknesses, and asked their forgiveness for any pain he might have inflicted upon them by petulant expressions, and haste of temper. 'I wished to be just and kind, as you know. My aim has been to make all around me happy. Pardon the infirmities, which have sometimes prevented me from carrying my intentions into effect. From the beginning of life, I am not conscious of having fallen into a crime; my life, even my early life, was pure; and I believe I was never false, though I have been faulty. This conviction is now my main consolation. I trust in God through Christ for the pardon of my sins. I wish to die, though I am afraid to complain of my sufferings; I hope when I am gone that you will reflect upon these my last words; and that my blessing may be blessed to every one of you.' *

Who would not have hastened to forgive what was so humbly, so generously lamented? Let the man, who would ridicule or aggravate the failings of such an one as Parr, ask of his conscience, whether at the close of a much shorter probation, he can hope, that it will thus testify for him. Happy he, who at

* Johnstone, pp. 835, 836.

any period can say, 'I am not conscious of having fallen into a crime!'

The consideration in which the character of Parr was held, the personal regards he inspired, and the deference paid to his opinions on all questions of criticism and taste, are evident from the vast variety and extent of his correspondence. 'Twenty volumes,' says Dr Johnstone, 'might be filled with the letters of his friends;' and in the catalogue, which he gives us, of at least fifteen hundred names, are found some of the noblest and the wisest of the land. Such a correspondence occupied, as may well be supposed, a considerable portion even of his studious hours, and, from the almost intolerable defects of his chirography, was the source of no little vexation, and sometimes of ludicrous errors. Mr Field relates, that he not unfrequently was compelled to send an express three or four miles to Hatton, to request of his friend to decipher for him a single word in a note.

As we do not often find princes in familiar correspondence with village pastors, we extract one or two passages from a letter of the Duke of Sussex, one of the younger sons of the late king. They are honorable to the writer, as they show the respectful kindness he entertained for Parr, and the liberal principles, civil and religious, by which, above all the members of his house, that prince has in various ways distinguished himself. We have been informed, that he has collected the rarest Biblical library of which we have note; and that his copies, in print or in manuscript, of the books of the two Testaments, single or united, exceed sixty thousand. It is to this library he invites in another letter his friend Parr.

'*Kensington Palace, Jan.* 25, 1823.

'MY DEAR DOCTOR,—Although far from well, I cannot refuse myself the pleasure of addressing you a few lines, recollecting well, that the twentysixth of January is your birthday; a day, most interesting to those, who have the gratification of knowing you, and enjoying your friendship, among which number I am proud to reckon myself. Yours, my dear and reverend friend, has been a long, industrious, and eventful life. Had common justice been done you, I should now have had the happiness and pride of seeing you placed in some situation, where your energies and talents would be more generally and usefully employed, for the benefit of the world at large; and where, I am sure, that you would exert all your powers for the maintenance and propagation of principles, which alas! are not regarded in quarters, where we could wish them to be protected, convinced, as we are, of their vital importance to the preservation of the constitution, and to the best interests of the community. It is with grief, I am forced to direct my letter to Hatton instead of some [episcopal] palace. But so goes the world; and *ours* is the loss, while you enjoy yourself, quietly surrounded by friends, and conscious of having done your duty.'—'I cannot say all that I feel upon the occasion, but I am indignant.'—

'So with hearty good wishes for your welfare and happiness, I have the pleasure to sign myself your *very, very* sincere friend and admirer,

AUGUSTUS FREDERICK.'*

It was honorable also to Sir Francis Burdett, who, though at one period conspicuous in the ranks of the Radical Reformers, is said to be distinguished for his high moral worth, that he was the friend and patron of Parr. The following letter contains a substantial proof of his regard. It was the means of securing to Dr Parr a competence, long before he attained to the affluence in which he spent his few last years; and possibly to some of our readers, it may be not uninteresting as a specimen of the summary manner in which even valuable church livings, in the hands of individual patrons, may be transferred.

'*Wimbledon, Tuesday, Sept.* 21, 1802.

'SIR,—I am sorry it is not in my power to place you in a situation, which would well become you, I mean in the Episcopal palace at Bugden [bishoprick of Lincoln]; but I can bring you very near it, for I have the presentation to a rectory, now vacant, within a mile and a half of it, which is very much at Dr Parr's service. It is the rectory of Graffham, at present worth two hundred pounds a year; and, as I am informed, may soon be worth two hundred and seventy, *and I this moment learn that the incumbent died last Tuesday.* Dr Parr's talents and character might will entitle him to better patronage than this, but I acknowledge,' &c. &c. 'I have the honor to be, Sir, with the greatest respect, your obedient servant,

FRANCIS BURDETT.'†

In both these letters, certainly from high authority, we find the same opinion in relation to Dr Parr's claims to the highest honors of the church.—But among all his numerous correspondents, there was no one to us more interesting, or whose character inspires a deeper sentiment of veneration and esteem, than that of Sir Samuel Romilly. That enlightened philanthropist, that upright counsellor, that incorruptible statesman and most amiable of men, was his faithful friend and adviser. 'In the whole circle of human society,' says Johnstone, 'there was no man, in whom he reposed greater confidence; and could the letters be collected, which he wrote to several friends on his death, they would combine almost every topic and every phrase of eulogy.' We could testify to the benevolence and self-sacrifice, with which he made the interests of the very humblest of his clients his own. His domestic affections were exquisitely tender; and when it is remembered, that in a moment of insupportable anguish, immediately occasioned by the death of a beloved wife, but aggravated to insanity by the pressure of professional and public cares, he lifted against himself a hand, that was never

* Works, vol. vii. pp. 4, 5. † Johnstone, p. 562.

lifted but in kindness to his fellow creatures,—the following prayer, found among his papers, and sent by his executor as a token of respect to Dr Parr, cannot, we think, be read without emotion.

'Almighty God! creator of all things! the source of all wisdom, and goodness, and virtue, and happiness! I bow down before thee, not to offer up prayers, for I dare not presume to think or hope, that thy most just, unerring, and supreme will can be in any degree influenced by any supplications of mine, nor to pour forth praises and adorations, for I feel that I am unworthy to offer them, but, in all humility, and with a deep sense of my own insignificance, to express the thanks of a contented and happy being, for the innumerable benefits, which he enjoys. I cannot reflect that I am an human being, living in civilized society, born the member of a free state, the son of virtuous and tender parents, blessed with an ample fortune, endowed with faculties which have enabled me to acquire that fortune myself, enjoying a fair reputation, beloved by my relations, esteemed by my friends, thought well of by most of my countrymen to whom my name is known, united to a kind, virtuous, enlightened, and most affectionate wife, the father of seven children, all in perfect health, and all giving by the goodness of their dispositions a promise of future excellence, and though myself far advanced in life, yet still possessed of health and strength, which seem to afford me the prospect of future years of enjoyment;—I cannot reflect on all these things and not express my gratitude to thee, O God, from whom all this good has flowed. I am sincerely grateful for all this happiness. I am sincerely grateful for the happiness of all those who are most dear to me, of my beloved wife, of my sweet children, of my relations, and of my friends.

'I prostrate myself, O Almighty and Omniscient God! before thee. In endeavouring to contemplate thy divine attributes, I seek to elevate my soul towards thee. I seek to improve and ennoble my faculties, and to strengthen and quicken my ardor for the public good. And I appear to myself to rise above my earthly existence, whilst I am indulging the hope, that I may at some time prove an humble instrument in the divine work of enlarging the sphere of human happiness.'—*Johnstone*, pp. 556, 557.

— We have already mentioned, that Dr Parr was accustomed, in the course of his weekly instructions, frequently to read the sermons of others; and that the liberality and independence of his spirit was evident, as in many other ways, so in the selection which he sometimes made from the discourses of Dissenters. This would be regarded as scarcely less than a sin by some of his more exclusive brethren. And it is with reference to this subject, that we find the following letter from Dr Rees, the learned editor of the Cyclopedia, who had presented him with a set of his printed sermons, some of which, with others of his friend, Mr Lindsay, Dr Parr had delivered to his parishioners at Hatton.

'*London, Feb.* 10, 1817.

'My Dear Sir,—I should be vain indeed, and think of myself more highly than I ought to think, if I did not attribute to your politeness and kindness many of those expressions of regard, which your last letter contain-

ed.'—'My sermons, selected from a mass of such compositions, at the desire of some partial friends, were not worthy of your acceptance, nor could I expect they would engage your attention; but they were the only tribute of respect, which I had in my power to present to Mrs Parr.'—'My friend Lindsay [the late eloquent and lamented successor of Dr Fordyce,] is no less gratified than myself by the notice you have taken of his performances in the same way [reading them from his pulpit]; and we both think that our productions will be much amended by your correction and *consecration.*—*Works*, vol. vii. p. 536.

In another letter, written not long before his death, he says;

'You, Sir, have done me a favor, and at the same time justice, by vindicating me from the contumelious appellation of a Socinian; and though *I am an avowed Unitarian*, I challenge to myself this distinction without being one of my friend Belsham's description. You will probably see his commentary on St Paul's Epistles. His friends have encouraged the publication by a very liberal subscription. His remuneration, as I am informed, amounts to *more than two thousand guineas.* It is written with candor and liberality on his avowed principles; and yet, without the presumption of being a very competent judge, I feel great doubt and difficulty in admitting the propriety and correctness of some parts of his paraphrase and criticisms.'—*Ibid.* p. 537.

Two things, we think, are observable in this letter of Dr Rees'; first, the noble remuneration obtained for a commentary on the Epistles; and we could wish, in passing, that a prospect of even an inconsiderable part of such a reward, might, with still higher motives, encourage the learned and laborious among ourselves, to similar much needed enterprises; and, secondly, we wish our readers to remark the distinction, on which Dr Rees here insists, between the exclusive notion of Unitarianism, as held by Mr Belsham, and that enlarged, and, in our apprehension, only proper acceptation of it, which, while it maintains the strict, simple doctrine of the Divine Unity, embraces all forms and degrees of faith in regard to the subordinate character of Jesus Christ. On this clear, obvious distinction, whoever is a believer in the Simple Unity of God, exclusive of all division or distinction of persons, is a Unitarian, however he may speculate as to the rank of Jesus Christ. He that believes that Jesus is the Son of God, and not God himself, is a Unitarian, however exalted may be the honors or the rank which he assigns to Christ. This distinction is perfectly intelligible—and it is moreover highly important. It is one, not of names and of party, but of things; for it marks the *object of worship.* It is a distinction, we contend, not for division, but for charity and peace; for it embraces all Christians of every class, *who do not maintain the contrary.* According to this, the whole controversy

involves a simple affirmation or denial. Is Jesus Christ God, one with the Father; or is he the Son of God, dependent on the Father? He that believes the former is a Trinitarian. He that believes the latter is a Unitarian. There is no alternative between the two. There is to our minds no intermediate faith, which, with any clearness of understanding a man can embrace; and any further distinction upon this subject we hold to be both unnecessary and unwarrantable. Yet as long as this distinction exists, and Christians feel and express the interest in it, which they ought, there must be a name to denote it; and we are persuaded, that the cause of gospel truth and charity—a cause dear to every christian heart—is most effectually advanced by the use of received terms, which everybody understands, and everybody may 'speak in love,' rather than by vague generalities, which convey no definite meaning and serve but to darken and confound the simplest subjects.

It was of Unitarianism in this *catholic* sense, that Dr Rees was the avowed professor; and it was of Unitarians of all classes, whenever their claims were denied, that Dr Parr was the generous and enlightend advocate. 'I hold,' says he, in a second letter of remonstrance to Archbishop Magee, 'without professing any partiality for Unitarians, I hold that they who acknowledge *Jesus Christ to be the promised Messiah*, to have had a direct and special commission from the Almighty, to have been endowed supernaturally with the Holy Spirit, to have worked miracles, to have suffered on the cross, and on the third day to have risen from the dead; yes, my Lord, I hold that men, thus believing, have a sacred claim to be called Christians.'—'Undisguisedly and indignantly I shall ever bear testimony against the *uncharitable spirit* which excludes the followers of Socinus utterly from the Catholic Church of Christ.'—'It pained me exceedingly to find, that your Grace adopted the invidious, and I must say fairly, the uncharitable language of those persons, who maintain that Socinians are not Christians. The Archbishop of Dublin ought not to be found among those, who hold such language.'*

It would be very easy to extend these notices of Dr Parr's correspondence, expressing his deliberate opinions and feelings on some of the most important topics. We can only add, that among the few foreigners, whose names appear in this connexion, we observe with pleasure a letter from the late President Jefferson, in which, paying a just tribute to the learning and character of the doctor, he solicits the favor of his aid in the formation of

* Works, Vol. vii. pp. 8—10.

a library for the University of Virginia. This aid was readily granted; and it was by Dr Parr's advice, and from a catalogue which he himself furnished, that a library of many thousand volumes was selected and procured for that rising institution.

To the *works* of Dr Parr, now first collected in seven sightly volumes, we can only refer our readers. Of these, many have been long known, and others are now for the first time published. They consist chiefly of political tracts, of critical notices or dissertations, of reviews, and of sermons. From the confidence and frequency with which his aid was solicited, not only by friends, but by strangers, in their literary or professional projects, and the generosity with which it was yielded, it appears that not a few, even of eminent writers, have plumed themselves in honors not their own. Of this, the most remarkable example is in the well known history of the Bampton Lectures, published at Oxford in 1784, by Professor White, which for a time obtained for the preacher a splendid reputation, but to which it was afterwards found, that Dr Parr had largely contributed. Of this course, one of the lectures was wholly written by him; and the materials of two others were furnished from his ample stores of Greek literature. The whole developement of this affair, with that of the assistance also of Mr Babcock, a Dissenting clergyman, of whom Parr was ignorant, forms a very curious correspondence, and exhibits an instance of literary fraud, not pardonable in any one, but least of all in a theological professor. The aid might have been honestly sought and received; but it could not without sin have been denied.

Of Dr Parr's political tracts, as they related much to topics of a local or temporary nature, the interest has subsided with the occasions that produced them. Still, many of them will be read with delight for the generous sentiments they inspire, for the elevated morality they maintain, for the noble spirit of freedom, civil and religious, which they breathe, and for their earnest eloquence. His Preface to Bellendenus,—the work of a Scotch writer of great taste and learning in the seventeenth century, to whom it is understood that Dr Middleton was much indebted for the materials of his Life of Cicero—has long been celebrated as a specimen of the purest modern Latinity. He was willing that on this and his epitaphs, some of which are to be read on the monuments of the illustrious dead in St Paul's and Westminster Abbey, his fame for classic literature should repose. In this preface, as well as in most others of his political tracts—his 'Serious Address to the Dissenters of Birmingham,' his 'Remarks on Politics, Jurisprudence, and Religion,' his 'Notes on Rapin's

Dissertation on Whigs and Tories,'—we find those graphic delineations of individual character, for which he was distinguished. In this species of writing he greatly delighted; and from the frequency in which he indulged in it, he was evidently conscious of his preeminent skill and success. He is not seldom indeed chargeable with affectation; he deals profusely in antithesis, and occasionally descends to caricature; but who does not read with pleasure his portraits of Jortin and Porson, of Bennett and Farmer, of Warburton and Priestley, of Pitt, Windham, and Burke?

Of his sermons, those on education, to which we have referred, though the first he published, are among the most valuable. They will be read with interest by every parent and instructer. They present the results of long experience, the matured reflections of a wise preceptor, a lover of virtue, and a friend of youth, who, though from temperament and principle a disciplinarian of the straitest sect, believing that much goodness and learning came with the rod, was eminently skilful and kind in discerning and cherishing, in guarding and correcting the various tendencies of youth.

Besides his Spital, or Hospital Sermon—an elaborate and somewhat pompous performance on an almost exhausted theme—there are others in the collection, which will be read with satisfaction. We particularly distinguished those on 'Conscience,' on 'Avoiding the Appearance of Evil,' and 'On the Habit of Judging Unrighteously.' But of these and his other works we cannot now attempt any particular notice.

On the whole, we have been exceedingly gratified and interested by these copious, faithful, and instructive Memoirs of one who filled a large space in the literary world, and who, with great faults, united fine capacities, profound learning, and exalted virtues; of one, too, who was the object of strong personal attachment and respect with multitudes of friends. That by his vanity and lofty pretensions, he sometimes 'made foul the clearness of his own deserving,' will not be disputed. But these, as well as other undeniable foibles, are honestly recorded by his biographers, who have separately accomplished well their design of exhibiting Parr *as he was*. To Mr Field, as a Dissenter, special credit is due for his fair and impartial estimate of the prejudices as well as excellences of his friend, who sometimes affected a Churchman's contempt for a Non-conformist. Perhaps, since Boswell's Life of Johnson, no character has been more exactly delineated.

As it was simply our purpose, in this article, to present a brief sketch of this celebrated scholar, to those of our readers who

might have no opportunity of perusing the large volumes in which he is seen in full length, we have for the most part allowed his biographers to speak for themselves, without reflections of our own. We cannot, however, but remark, and we think it will be obvious to all, that on a mind like Parr's, the religious establishment, of which he was a minister and on the whole a faithful son, could have exerted no salutary influence. To his 'honest and ingenuous spirit,' its articles and restrictions, its creeds and its canons, must have been a perpetual embarrassment. His outward compliance with some of its forms could not have been but at a painful expense of his integrity. And though we are scrupulous, as becomes us, of judging another man's conscience, yet to us it seems, that for Parr, and all others like him; for Paley and his patron, Bishop Law, for Watson, for Blackburne, and we had almost added the honored name of Clarke—the strait and narrow path of integrity lay *without* and not *within* the pale of the Church of England. We well know how much may be urged, and that with a large show of worldly wisdom, to the contrary. It may be said, that these generous asserters of religious liberty, were doing more good by diffusing their own liberal spirit among their brethren, than they could have done, had they come out from them, and been separate. We know too the reconciling power of education, of time, and habit. We readily allow for the flattering disguises, under which interest, domestic affections, honorable ambition, and even a sincere love of usefulness, may present themselves to the fairest and noblest minds; and who can be sure for himself, that, under like influences and like temptations, he would have done more worthily? Neither are we insensible to the attractions of that magnificent establishment. We do not wonder, in the least, when we cast an eye over her colleges and halls, her splendid temples, her village churches, her munificent charities, consecrated by the piety and learning of ages, 'that her servants should take pleasure in her stones, and favor the dust thereof.' We should delight once more to survey her venerable cathedrals, and could yield ourselves without one dissenting scruple to the inspirations of the scene. We honor the great and the good of past and present times, of whom that church can say, 'Behold my sons.' But after all—and we have conceded much—when we look at her articles, we look in vain for the simplicity of christian faith, or in her ritual for the simplicity of christian worship; and we remember the answer

of a sturdy Dissenter, on being asked by a bishop, who well knew the 'worth of the man,' why he would not conform, and exchange his poor chapel and school-keeping for a good promotion;—'Promotion, my Lord, may be good; but I count *downright honesty* to be better. And since I must one day give an account of myself to God, I would not, even for your mitre, exchange the rejoicing of my conscience, that as of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ.'

ART. XIV.—*Vindication of the Rights of the Churches of Christ. First printed in the Spirit of the Pilgrims.* Boston. Pierce & Williams. 1828. 8vo. pp. 48.

[Continued from p. 316.]

WE have said, that we might safely admit all that has been advanced by the vindicator of the rights of the churches, as to the early usages of the churches of New England, without in any degree impairing the force of the reasoning, by which the late decisions in the Supreme Judicial Court were supported. But we are aware, that the array of inapplicable authorities, and the confident tone assumed by the vindicator, are calculated, as they were intended, to impose on weak minds, and on persons who are not disposed to examine such questions with the labor which their thorough investigation demands. We shall therefore proceed to examine minutely, the authorities by which the vindicator supports his arguments, and the arguments themselves. If in doing this, we shall appear to intelligent readers to adopt a loose, and rambling mode of discussion, we beg them to attribute the defect to the work which we are reviewing, for we shall follow that, *pari passu*.

The vindicator of the exclusive rights of the church begins with the following summary;—

'The Massachusetts colony commenced in 1629. Until 1641, a period of eleven or twelve years, no law is known to have passed on the subject, and Chief Justice Parker thinks, "without doubt, the *whole assembly* were considered the church," and were entitled to vote in the choice of pastor.—We have shown already, that the whole assembly, at this period was *not* considered the church; but the church was a distinct and well defined body, whose members had made a public profession of their faith, and entered into solemn covenant with God. It may now be shown conclusively, that the *churches*, at this early period, *chose their own pastors*.' p. 12.

The writer then proceeds, under four distinct heads, to prove this proposition to be true.

It will essentially shorten discussion, to admit what all parties know to be true, while it is no light evidence of the consciousness of a weak cause, to find writers wasting their own time, and wearying out the patience of their readers, in advancing propositions, and adducing evidence in support of them, which no person has ever thought of disputing. The churches did unquestionably usurp the power of choosing the minister, and they obtained laws for the maintenance of that usurpation, which laws continued in full and undiminished force, till 1692. This fact has again and again been fully admitted, in this work. It is admitted by all the learned Judges in their arguments. Yet it is nevertheless true, as Chief Justice Parker said in the paragraph above quoted, 'that the whole assembly were considered the church,' because no man could vote in town or parish affairs, who was not a church member. The church, not contented with its ecclesiastical power, not satisfied with holding the keys of St Peter, which alone could unlock the gates of heaven, insisted upon having in its possession, the gates and entrance to civil power. No man could vote for a selectman, or for opening a street, unless he possessed the certificate of the ruling elder, that *he was approved by him.* The government was as truly hierarchical as that of the church of Rome in its worst days. It was this usurpation, unquestionably, which led to the declaration of independence in 1692; a declaration as important to our religious liberty, as that of 1776 was to our civil freedom.

Let us now listen to the exposition, which this candid advocate for ecclesiastical usurpation makes of the noble effort of 1692, to restore to the religious public, the rights of which they had been for fifty years deprived. We doubt whether any example in the Cromwellian dynasty can equal it in sophistry and misrepresentation. We shall give it at full length;—

'In 1692, soon after the erection of the colonies into one province by the charter of king William,' [that is to say, as soon as civil and religious liberty was restored to the parent country and to the colonies—*that* was the glorious era, which our ancestors seized to vindicate their long lost religious liberties,] 'it was enacted, that "every minister, being a person of good conversation, able, learned, and orthodox, that shall be chosen by the *major part of the inhabitants of any town, at a town meeting duly warned for that purpose, shall be the minister of such town,* and the *whole town* shall be obliged to pay towards his settlement and maintenance."'—p. 14.

Here we pause—and we conjure all men of all parties to accompany us in the following remarks on this most important act. This act provides, as the Constitution of 1780 provides, and in

equivalent terms, that the people of every town shall have the sole and exclusive right of electing their minister. It provides, that all persons in the town, church members as well as others, shall be liable for the support of such minister. This the Constitution also provides. It is this point precisely, and no more than this, that the Judges of our Supreme Judicial Court have solemnly decided in repeated cases which have been submitted to them. They have simply declared, that the Constitution of this State restored the people to the rights, all the rights, and no more than the rights, which the legislature of 1692, warmed by the spirit of the revolution of 1688, guaranteed to them. This is their offence, and the whole of it. Now mark how a mind bent upon the destruction of the religious privileges of the people, can sophistically twist provisions so clear, and so just.

'This law is *usually* represented as depriving the church of its right in the choice of a pastor. But the law itself says nothing of this, and we do not see on what the inference is founded. The subject of the law is, not the church and its *pastor*, but the *town and its minister*. And what is taken from the church is not, as we understand it, the right of choosing its own pastor, but that of choosing a minister for the town.'—p. 14.

It is an old adage, that none are so blind as those who will not see. If the town had the sole right to choose a minister for the whole town, and every man, church member or not, was by law held to contribute to his support, we are not able to see, why he was not the legal minister of the church. It is not, however, because this evasion is so pitiable, that we are induced to take notice of it. It affects the character of the work in which it appears, and of the writer. Did he expect, that any intelligent man would believe, that the law of 1692, the words of which are correctly given in the above quotation, left the church in full possession of its right to choose its own pastor? Or did he believe it himself? Did he believe that the legislators of 1692 made the distinction between the pastor of the church, and the minister of the parish? If they did, why did they not reserve, by express terms, the right of the church? Why did they make the church members liable to support the minister of the parish, in whose election, as a church, they had no voice? Suppose the law of 1693 had never been enacted; would not the parish have continued to this day to elect a minister? And would not the minister so elected have enjoyed all the rights, powers, privileges, and exemptions, which the ministers previously elected by the churches had enjoyed from 1642 to 1692? Was this not the understanding of all parties at the time, and did not the church party exert all their influence to obtain the law of 1693?

What was the law of 1693? Let us learn its provisions from the vindicator of the rights of the churches;—

'The law [of 1692] was not sufficiently explicit, and in many places could not be enforced.' p. 14.

This is unfounded. No ambiguity whatever can be pointed out in its provisions, and, as it was repealed in one year, it is impossible that there could have been 'many places,' in which it could not be enforced. We challenge this writer to show one case in the course of that year, in which an attempt was made to enforce the law without effect. This is one of those bold assertions, with which the Groton Result, and this still bolder and more rash defence of the usurpations of the church, are replete. The writer proceeds;—

'Accordingly it was repealed the next year, [1693,] and in place thereof it was enacted, "that each respective gathered *church*, in any town or place, being in want of a minister, shall have power, according to the directions given in the word of God, to *choose their own minister*;' [not *pastor* as these writers choose to designate the peculiar officer of the church,] 'and the major part of such inhabitants as do there usually attend on the public worship of God, and are by law duly qualified for voting in *town* affairs' [mark it—'*in town affairs*'] '*concurring with the church's act*, and the persons thus elected and approved accepting thereof, and settling with them, shall be *their minister*," &c.'—*Ibid.*

Let us now see, what was the operation of this law. The church had a right of election, and if the town or parish concurred, the minister was duly elected and settled. If the town or parish did not concur, the election was absolutely void. The person elected by the church did not continue to be the pastor or minister of the church. If he had, the connexion could not have been dissolved, but by a council regularly called. That this was the interpretation, as well as legal intendment of that law, is proved by the whole history of the churches of this State, from 1693 to the decision in the Sandwich case. It was precisely, in terms, like the election of officers of Harvard College. The corporation elect, but if the overseers refuse to concur, the election is null. So also in the elections of major generals of this State, and of senators of the United States; if one branch of the legislature elect, and the other refuse to concur, the first election is void.

Where then was the *right* of the church, the immemorial, undeniable right of the church to elect their own pastor from 1693 to 1780, when the Constitution vested the ultimate right in the people? They could not choose their own pastor, without the concurrence of the town or parish. This pretended right was, therefore, as the lawyers say, in abeyance, for a century. It could not be exercised. Their elections were void, if the town or parish

so willed. All that can be affirmed, is, that they had a voice in the choice of ministers. But this is a proposition widely different from that which has been assumed. Since 1692, it may be therefore affirmed, without hazard of contradiction, that the church has never possessed the right of choosing its own pastor. That they were indulged in the privilege of a voice in the election, is true; but the Constitution took that away as a matter of *right*, and left it a matter of courtesy merely. This is a topic, to which we shall have frequent occasion to recur, in following the ever changing, loose, and incoherent reasoning of the writer under review. Upon the laws of 1693 and 1695, the vindicator of the rights of the churches makes the following remarks;—

'Here the subject rested, until the adoption of the Constitution, in 1780; a period of eightyfive years. During all this while, the church continued to choose its own pastor, and the town or parish its own minister; and the choice falling ultimately, in almost every case, upon the same person, the churches had rest, and the interests of religion were secured and promoted.'—pp. 14, 15.

This is a palpable, and if the writer lays claim to any character as an accurate writer, a wilful misrepresentation. The church did not choose its own pastor;—it chose a minister for the parish, for all the parish. The town had no power, by the act, to choose a minister; it had only a negative on the choice of the church. It could not choose its own minister, and any man of common sense, even if not a lawyer, on reading the above recited act, will see that this is a misrepresentation of it. It was because the town had no right to choose its own teacher, that the Constitution abolished the act of 1693, and vested the right in the parties who were bound to support the minister.

Much has been said in the Groton Result, and repeated in this new pamphlet, about the REST of the churches under the laws of 1693 and 1695, and the acquiescence of the parishes under them for eightyfive years. This subject requires a distinct notice. There were, it is true, few cases of dispute between the churches and the towns and parishes between 1693 and 1780, and it is easy to perceive why these could not have happened. In the first place, there were few or no dissensions or differences as to doctrinal points between the churches and the parishioners at large, during the greater part of this period. The question of election was therefore one of little moment. It is true, that in the early part of the eighteenth century, there were some clergymen in Essex and elsewhere, who began to doubt the doctrines of Calvin, and of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Tucker, Lowell, and some others in Essex, were called moderate Calvinists, and in fact were Arminians. But as their people were united, and

devotedly attached to them, no questions arose. In addition to this, as the parish or town possessed exclusively the right of fixing the salary, and of raising taxes for the support of the minister, the power of election was a mere shadow. The church commonly did not elect until it knew that the minister would be acceptable to the parish. When however it did so happen, and the parish refused its concurrence, the church, by the law of 1695, had a right to call an ecclesiastical council, and if the choice of the church was approved, the minister elected by the church might be settled against the wishes of the town or parish. We have repeatedly challenged the advocates of church rights to produce one case in the eighty-five years, in which the church ever successfully appealed to that remedy. In that period there were probably many cases of choice by the churches in which the towns did not concur. What stronger proof can be given of the jealousy of ecclesiastical power, than that an act should have remained in full force for eighty-five years, without a single attempt, except the famous one at Middleborough, to enforce the law. In that case, be it remembered, an ecclesiastical council undertook to settle a minister against the will of the town under the act of 1695. The town chose another minister, and he was duly settled by another ecclesiastical council, who declared that the former settlement was made against the usages of our churches and ancestors.

But, say these advocates for church supremacy, 'the churches had rest' from 1693 to 1780, and the people were satisfied. Why then, we ask, did not the Convention reestablish, *totidem verbis*, the provision of 1693? This we have asked before, and no reply has been attempted. We now mean to enforce more at large the argument founded on this important fact. The provisions of the law of 1693 were as short, clear, and simple as those of the Constitution of 1780. Why then did Governor Strong, Samuel Adams, and Samuel Phillips, the founder of the Andover Institution, repeal the statute of 1693, and substitute a provision directly *repugnant to it?* For, even if the absurd construction which is put upon it by the Groton Result, and this new writer, be admitted—and we shall show it to be absurd—but if it be admitted, still the Constitution repealed the law of 1693, and that even by the concession of these writers themselves. The law of 1693 gave to the church the right of electing the minister for the town, procuring the concurrence of the town to the choice. The Constitution gives the *exclusive* right of electing their religious teacher to the people of the several towns, parishes, precincts, bodies politic, or religious societies. Admit then the ridiculous pretension, of which no lawyer ever dreamed, that the churches are within this provision as bodies politic, still they have no longer the right to choose the minister for the parish, as they had before, unless an

exclusive right is a *concurrent* one, which even these gentlemen will hardly have the fearlessness to contend. The Constitution, then, repealed the statute of 1693, and vested the right of choice ultimately and absolutely, in the people of every parish. We shall reserve for discussion in another place, the question, whether the Constitution also secured to the churches the naked, fruitless, tantalizing right of electing a pastor, with whom, as a church, they had no power to contract, and to whom, *in their capacity of a church*, they had no power to pledge either the real or personal estate of its members.

So much then have we to say in reply to the preliminary part of this writer's argument. We shall now proceed to consider, what he himself considers his main grounds, and which, we are free to say, if supported by facts or legal principles, would have some weight.

The two main points on which the vindicator of the rights of the churches supports his attack on the decisions of the Supreme Judicial Court, are,—First, that the churches of Massachusetts are, and have always been, bodies politic, or religious societies, in the sense in which those terms are used in the Constitution, and in the statute of 1800; and Secondly, that they are independent bodies, having a separate existence, and not necessarily attached to, and forming a part of the incorporated towns, parishes, and precincts, with which they have *de facto*, been inseparably united for two hundred years.

To lawyers, and to other men of cultivated intellects, who have attended to this question, it is apparent, that both these positions must be made out, or the attempt to bring into discredit the decisions of the Court, must fail. For if the churches are not 'bodies politic or religious societies,' in the sense in which these terms are used in the Constitution and in the statute of 1800, then their right of election is taken away by the clause which vests the *exclusive* right of choice in towns, parishes, precincts, and bodies politic or religious societies. So indeed the framers of the Groton Result and their new defender, seem to understand, and to admit. But even if churches are bodies politic, and yet are still so inseparably united to the other corporate bodies, towns, parishes, and precincts, as to be incapable of a separate existence, or if capable of it, lose all the civil rights, which belonged to them while they were so united, as soon as they voluntarily separate themselves, then the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dedham case was correct, and the argument against it fails.

No man who has read the Groton Result, the review of it in the Examiner of March and April, 1827, and the article in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, since published in a pamphlet under the title of 'Vin-

dication of the Rights of the Churches of Christ,' can doubt, that this last work was designed to bolster up the weak and inefficient argument contained in the Groton Result, and as an answer—and it was announced as a triumphant one—to the review of that work, and yet it is at first blush singular that no allusion whatever is made to either of the former articles. A little reflection, however, will enable us to explain this change in the form of attack. There were gross and palpable errors, as well as imprudent concessions in the Groton Result, which it was found not possible to defend, and not politic to admit. And there were, in the review, arguments advanced, which it was seen could not be answered, and which were fatal to the whole pretensions of the churches.—Before we enter into the examination of the specious, but extremely feeble pretensions, on which the claims of the churches to be 'bodies politic,' are reposed, in the new work under notice, we shall recapitulate and enlarge upon the reasons assigned in our review of the Groton Result, why the churches could not be considered bodies politic. Let us commence by showing what bodies politic are, and what particulars are essential to their very existence.

Judge Blackstone lays down the following particulars as being essential to all corporations;—

'When a corporation is erected, a *name must* be given to it; and by that *name alone* it must sue and be sued, and do all legal acts, though a very minute variation therein is not material. *Such name* is the *ery being* of its constitution—and though it is the will of the king that erects the corporation, yet the *name* is the knot of its combination, without which it *could not perform its corporate functions*.'—'After a corporation is so formed and named, it acquires many powers, rights, capacities and incapacities, which we are next to consider. Some of these are— * * * * *

'First, to have perpetual succession.' [This need not be quoted at large, because we admit, that if churches are corporations they have perpetual succession.]

'Secondly, to sue and be sued, implead or be impleaded, grant or receive, by its *corporate name*, and do all other acts as natural persons may.'—

'Fourthly, to have a common seal. For a corporation, being an invisible body, cannot manifest its intentions by any personal act or oral discourse; it therefore acts and speaks only by its common seal.'*

In our review of the Groton Result we maintained, that the churches of this State never possessed, exercised, or enjoyed any

* 1 Blackstone, pp. 474, 475.

one of these privileges or powers, which the ablest commentator on the law pronounces to be essential to their very existence. Nor let illiterate, or less informed persons believe that this is British law only. The positions laid down by Judge Blackstone are at this hour the law of Massachusetts. We undertake now to repeat, that the churches of Massachusetts, associated with parishes, never had a *corporate name*. They never had a name by which they, or any of them, could sue or be sued, implead or be impleaded. If a lawyer were now called upon to draw up a legal description of any one of them, he would be compelled to describe it as the 'Church of the First Parish in Roxbury,' or the 'Church of the First Religious Society in Wareham,' as the case might be, or by some other descriptive term, indicating its necessary connexion with some incorporated society; and it is the knowledge of this fact, this undoubted fact, which, among other almost innumerable reasons, led our highest Court of Law, familiar with all our statutes, and our whole course of legislation and jurisprudence, to say, that the churches were inseparably connected with other and well known incorporated bodies. It was because the churches had no *corporate name*, independent of the legal and incorporated societies, with whose very essence they had been united from the moment of their existence, that the Judges, among other reasons, deemed them to be *necessary appendages to these corporate bodies*.

Secondly, the churches, from 1630 to this hour, have never sued or been sued, nor were they capable of suing or liable, as churches, to be sued or impleaded. No lawyer ever dreamed of suing in the name of a church, and no one would now dream of suing or impleading any church in this Commonwealth. A writ in the name of a church would be at once abated, as being in favor of a body, *not known to our laws*. This, it may be said, is our simple assertion. But churches have existed for two hundred years, and we challenged, in our former review, and we repeat the challenge to these critics of the decisions of our courts, to produce a case of any suit for or against any church. This failure of any evidence on this most important point, for two centuries, would, of itself, far outweigh all the flimsy reasoning of this writer; but we have evidence still more conclusive. Why did not the Dedham church, in the great cause under review, sue *in its own corporate name*, if it ever had one, instead of suing in the name of Eliphalet Baker and another? It is plain, then, that the lawyers in that case, had never discovered what has been since revealed to *these* advocates, that the churches were incorporated bodies.

But thirdly, the churches in this State never had a corpo-

rate seal, without which no corporate body can legally act. The signatures of every member of the church could not avail to render valid a lease or deed of any of the church lands. The churches, therefore, never acted as corporate bodies from the year 1630 to the year 1780, or even to this day.

The writer under review speaks fluently of corporations by *prescription*. That such existed in Great Britain, in which the charter of the king was presumed from the great lapse of time in which corporate powers had been exercised, we know and admit. But we deny that any such corporate bodies exist in this State. The crown itself granted our first charters; but since the settlement of the country, all incorporations have been made by the legislature of the State. There are no vacancies in our statute books, no lost acts; and therefore there can be no presumption that there may have been acts of incorporation, which are now forgotten. In the trials of the several causes in question, no such pretension, we are persuaded, was set up; nor is it believed that any lawyer in the State would hazard his reputation by contending that the churches are bodies politic.—We shall now proceed to consider the grounds on which the vindicator of the rights of the churches rests their claims to corporate privileges.

This writer begins his argument by reciting the famous proviso of the third article of the Massachusetts Bill of Rights, in these words; 'that the several towns, parishes, precincts, *and* other bodies politic, *or* religious societies, shall at all times have the *exclusive* right of electing their public teachers, and of *contracting* with them for their support and maintenance.' Upon this fatal, and irremediable clause, subverting at one blow, and that blow, a well considered, well directed, and intentional one, all hope of ecclesiastical dominion in this Commonwealth, the vindicator of church supremacy remarks;—

'This language has been thought by some,' [that is, by half a score of Judges, and all the lawyers in the State] 'to take from the church the right of electing its own pastor, and to place it, in this respect, entirely within the power of the parish. But to this conclusion we can by no means subscribe. We are unwilling to charge those venerable men, who framed the Constitution of this Commonwealth, with so great and needless an innovation upon the immemorial usages of the country; and still more, with so gross impropriety and injustice, as the interpretation above given would imply. Would they, by a single clause, take from perhaps five hundred churches, a right which had been guaranteed to them by immemorial usage, by long established laws, and (as they *supposed)* by Christ himself?' p. 15.

This is what the schoolmen would call the *argumentum ex*

absurdo. Now to this tirade we reply in the language of common sense, that most assuredly, these very venerable men never did intend to deprive the church of any rights which '*they supposed Christ himself*' had guaranteed. They had too deep a veneration for what Christ taught, or established, to diminish it in the most minute particular. But they were men, also, who would have deemed it a profanation of his holy name to cite it on a question of the distribution of power among his professed disciples. They would have considered the attempt to represent him as the founder of an usurpation by a body calling itself, by way of eminence, *the church*, to the exclusion of the great mass of professing Christians, as most presumptuous. But yet these venerable men, men whom the writer admits to be such, *did commit this deed*, and they gloried in it, as we shall show in the sequel. They did take from the church the power to elect their own teacher in the last resort, if after repeated trials to produce a united choice, the parish and church could not agree. But in what respect is this more extraordinary, than that the legislature in 1692, when the churches were in the plenitude of their power, and as yet undisturbed with the pestilent Arminian and Unitarian heresies, should do precisely the same thing? The proviso in the Bill of Rights of 1780, is only a reenactment and confirmation of the law of 1692.

We shall be told, however, that this is a *petitio principii*, a taking for granted the whole matter in dispute; that this writer denies that the law of 1692 deprived the churches of their right of choice. We have, we acknowledge, but little charity as to the sincerity of this denial, nor can we think much of *that right*, which, while it compelled every church member to contribute to the extent of his property, both towards the settlement and maintenance of a minister chosen *solely by the town*, left him a naked right to choose a pastor, without means of support. This was indeed to give to the children of the church a stone, when they asked for bread. But when this writer was pressing his argument *ex absurdo*, how did he happen to forget the passage which we quoted in our review of the Groton Result from the address of the Convention, signed by the venerable Samuel Adams, by which it appeared, that this subject was most fully dicussed, and thoroughly understood by the Convention of 1780?

The writer proceeds to argue, that the clause of the Constitution above recited, is 'not inconsistent' with the right of the church still to elect its pastor, in the following strain;—

'If it is inconsistent with it, and was intended and known to be at the time of its adoption, how can it be accounted for that its adoption was not strenuously *opposed by the churches.* Why did they acquiesce in it? How could they, indeed, without surrendering their dearest natural rights, abandoning all previous usage, reproaching the memory of their fathers, violating acknowledged duty, and *betraying the cause of their Lord and Master?*' pp. 15, 16.

It is thus, that ambitious men, covetous of unwarrantable power, profanely invoke the most sacred names in support of their own pretensions. We have numerous satisfactory replies to these questions, from which we shall select a few. The first is, that the churches in 1780 did not entertain the same ambitious views, with which a few uneasy men are now attempting to inspire them. The second is, that the church members were then, as they are now, but a tenth part of the whole number of Christians, who contributed by their fortunes, talents, and influence to the support of religious instruction. They knew that the old system had been a direct and palpable infraction of the laws of civil and religious liberty, and that their opposition, if they had made it, would not only be of no avail, but would tend to deprive the churches of that preeminence, which courtesy, and a respect for the usages of our ancestors, would induce the laymen to continue to concede to them. Thirdly, the churches thought, that the third article of the Bill of Rights, compelling all citizens to the support of public worship, was a most ample remuneration for the cession of their own unwarrantable power, granted by the law of 1693. They saw that Virginia had, two years before, denied the right of the civil ruler to interfere in any manner on the subject of religion, and both the priesthood and the church were very grateful to find, that at a moment when all the old foundations of society had been shaken, and illustrious men were called together to settle them anew, they were not unwilling to make the support of religion a matter of *constitutional requirement.* It should not be forgotten, in reviewing this part of our history, that there were many sects, embracing, even at that time, one fourth part of our whole population, who denied the right of the civil rulers to coerce the people, in any way, to the support of religion. To the incumbent priesthood, four hundred in number, whose influence over the churches was unlimited, it was no light matter to feel secured in their livings, and to have a legal remedy, guaranteed by the Constitution; and they most cheerfully surrendered a right, which was before merely a nominal one, of leading in the election, trusting doubtless, and they did not trust in vain, to the courtesy of the laymen, to allow them

their accustomed privilege, so long as and whenever it might not trench upon their own invaluable, imprescriptible, and forever inalienable right of selecting their own teachers. These are some of the reasons, why the churches did not object to this new arrangement.

But lastly, our most conclusive remark is, that when the Convention lately met to revise our Constitution of 1780, and when the construction put upon the proviso of the third article in the Bill of Rights, in the case of Avery *vs.* Tyringham, in 1807, twentyone years since, and in the case of Burr and Sandwich, and in the Dedham case, was well understood, and had been arraigned by Judge Haven, with far greater ability than in either of the late attacks by clerical men, not a word was said in opposition to this construction. The third article was discussed *more fully* than any other. All the law talent of the State, on the Orthodox side, was present, and not a lisp, not a whisper was heard against these decisions. We urged this same point in our former review, but a most discreet silence has been maintained on this subject by the new laborer. This, we think, is a full answer to the queries put by our author.

But we have a still more curious argument to prove, that the rights claimed for the church, are 'not inconsistent' with the Constitution; to wit, the opinions of the Judges themselves; opinions in which they expressly deny this right. This is to be sure a very fearless mode of attack, and we think it will appear to be as rash as it is fearless. The amount of it seems to be, that the Judges did not understand what they said, and that they made concessions fatal to their own conclusions. Let us examine the question.

'But we have *farther* evidence,' [having cited none] 'that the Constitution is not inconsistent with the right of the church to elect its own pastor. The truth is, the churches generally have exercised this right, ever since the adoption of the Constitution; and what is more, they have done it by the *advice* and *recommendation* of the highest judicial authority in the State. Says the Hon. Judge Sedgwick (in Avery *vs.* Tyringham) "The mode of settling ministers has continued in every respect the *same*, since the establishing of the Constitution, that it was before. The church call the minister; the town, at a legal meeting, concur in the invitation and vote the salary; and the minister, after solemn consideration, accepts the invitation," &c. Chief Justice Parsons, in the same case, speaking of these ancient usages, observes, "They so manifestly tend to the preservation of good order, peace, and harmony among the people, in the exercise of their religious privileges, it may be presumed that a *departure from them will never be admitted* by any town, but in cases of necessity." Chief Justice Parker, speaking on the same subject, says, "We agree with him" (C. J. Parsons) "in *estimating highly these ancient usages*, protected as the people are by the constitutional provision, and in *hoping that they may be observed in future*, as they have been in past times."' p. 16.

After these quotations the writer proceeds;—

'We have here the testimony of our Supreme Judges, that, since the adoption of the Constitution, the churches have elected their own pastors, as they did previously; and what is of much more consequence, we have their *earnest recommendation* that the practice may continue. But would these high expositors and guardians of the Constitution recommend a practice which was *inconsistent* with the Constitution—*repugnant* to it—and which the Constitution was designed to abolish? It cannot and will not be believed. pp. 16, 17.

We have cited this most precious piece of Orthodox reasoning at full length, because if we had stated it in any other than the writer's own words, it would not be believed.

Yes, it is true, that the learned Judges in the case of Avery *vs.* Tyringham, did most earnestly and strenuously urge an adherence to the ancient usages, while they declared at the same time, that by the express terms of the Constitution, the right was abolished. Was there any inconsistency in this course? Ought not the churches to feel grateful to them for this attempt to sustain their moral influence, while they were compelled to say, that the legal power was gone? Who ever dreamed that it was *inconsistent* with, or *repugnant* to the Constitution for the towns to concede to the churches, the first expression of an opinion over which they held an ultimate legal control? Our clerical writers, not conversant with the sound maxims of our common law, had never heard the well known doctrine, expressed in sounder sense, than elegant Latin, '*Quisquis potest renunciare beneficium pro se introductum.*' 'It is competent to every person to give up what is intended for his own advantage.' There is no question, that a town might permit, and towns have almost invariably, since, as well as before the Constitution, *permitted* the church to express its opinion, as to the call of a pastor, without in any degree compromitting their right of ultimate decision. This permission, the result of courtesy, is now made the ground of denying the plainest provision in the whole Constitution! Such is the effect of liberality on minds incapable of feeling its influence. That the public may, however, fully comprehend this sinister, and, to our minds, most *dishonorable* perversion of the opinions of the Court, in the case of Avery *vs.* Tyringham, we shall give an enlarged history of that case.

These disturbers of the religious peace of the Commonwealth have, it is well known, dared to intimate, what every man knows to be untrue, that the Supreme Judicial Court have, in the late decisions on the third article of the Constitution, been influenced by the religious opinions of the parties to the controversy.

The case of Avery *vs.* Tyringham, unfortunately for them brought into view, will entirely exculpate that honorable Court, if to any honorable minds, they require any exculpation. This action was brought by Mr Avery for the recovery of his salary against the town of Tyringham. It was rebutted on the ground, that the town had voted his dismission, and that by the third article of the Bill of Rights, as every town had a right, *at all times*, to elect its own religious teacher, it had, of course, a right to dismiss him at *any time;* otherwise they might be compelled to support a teacher, with whose opinions they were not satisfied. Various other arguments were urged on the same side of the question. The Court, to wit, *Parker*, Sedgwick, and *Parsons*, unanimously decided in favor of the *incumbent*, that the contract was *for life*, determinable only by the decision of an ecclesiastical council, unless, perhaps, in case of gross immorality, or neglect of parochial duties. Every clergyman in the State owes his present security in his living, to the noble stand taken by these honorable men in their favor, of whom Chief Justice Parker, so much abused by this writer, was one.

It should be remembered, and indeed never forgotten, that the first case in which Chief Justice Parsons expressed his opinion on this proviso of the third article, was one, in which no sectarian question *could* arise; that it was long before any controversy had ever taken place between the heretical Unitarians, and the only true Christians—some years before the case of Burr *vs.* Sandwich, and when, unless he had the Scotch gift of second sight, or what he did not pretend to, the spirit of prophecy, he could not foresee whether his construction would favor one party more than another. What, then, did this great lawyer, himself a member of the Convention which framed the third article of the Bill of Rights, at that time, when deciding *against a town* and in favor of a *church*, declare to be its meaning? He said, 'By the Constitution, the *rights* of the town are *enlarged, if it choose to exercise them*, and those of the *church impaired.* If the church, when their election has been disapproved by the town, shall *unwisely* refuse to make a new election, or the town for *any cause* shall abandon the ancient usages of the country in settling a minister, it may, *without* or *against* the *consent of the church*, elect a public teacher, and contract to support him.' This opinion of the greatest lawyer in the State, entirely unbiassed, is now the law of the land. It has been since sustained by a succession of as able men, as any state can ever hope to see on the bench of its highest court.

We shall stop here, to consider in what absurdities and self-contradictions this novel doctrine of *two* bodies in *one* religious society or corporation, both having *exclusive* rights to do the same acts, has involved our writer, but from which the plainer and bolder doctrine of the Groton Result enabled its authors to escape.

'The Constitution,' he tells us, 'says "that towns, parishes, precincts, &c. shall have at all times the exclusive right of electing their public teachers," &c. And so say we. It is their natural right, and they ought to have it. The church has no right to impose a religious teacher, an officer, upon the town or parish, against its will. Let the parish have, what the Constitution gives it, the exclusive right of choosing its own religious teacher.—But is the exercise of this right on the part of the parish at all inconsistent with the rights of the church? We think not.' p. 16.

What becomes, then, of the act of 1693? That, as we have already remarked, gave the right of choice to the church, with only a negative on the part of the parish. The parish had no power to select a teacher. It must have waited, however long, till the church should select one agreeable to itself. The act of 1693, was, therefore, by the concession of this writer, a violation of the natural rights of the parish; and he would seem to admit, that by substituting an *exclusive* right for each, absurd as such a construction appears, the act of 1693 was abolished. But this is not the construction of the Groton Result, nor of this *writer himself*, who, in other passages, contends that the Constitution made no change in this particular. Let us listen to his own words.

'It may be inquired here, whether, according to the exposition given of existing laws, any *alteration* has been made by the adoption of the Constitution. And we answer, an alteration *in a single particular*, has been made. The provision of the law of 1695, by which, in case of difference between church and parish, the church, with the advice and consent of an ecclesiastical council, *might impose* a minister on the parish, is annulled. Under the Constitution, the church has no such power as this; and we are *quite willing* it should be so.' p. 18.

We are glad to receive on the part of Exclusive Christians, any concessions whatever, however insincere we may know and can prove them to be. It shows that the cause of christian liberty has made some progress, when its most inveterate enemies feel compelled to use such language. It is something to have an admission, that parishes have a *natural right to do anything*, without the consent of the church. It is much more, when a writer in the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims' admits, that the law of 1695, enacted by the Pilgrims and their descendants, was an '*imposition*' on the parishes which he is '*willing*' to give

up. 'Willing' to give up? No. The pretension is false and hollow, and we shall now show from his own words, and the conduct of his party, that it is so.

In a note to the very page from which our last extract is made, we have the following ingenuous confession.

'We shall show by and by, that the first churches in Massachusetts not only chose their pastors, but *contracted* with them, and assessed and collected money for their maintenance.' [And we, the reviewers, shall show, that they have proved no such thing, but have committed the most lamentable blunders on this subject, from loose and careless investigation.] 'The first church in Boston, it seems, continued this practice, for almost an hundred years. Many churches have the ability to do this now, and *ought to have the* RIGHT, if they please to exercise it. We are thankful that this right is secured to them by the Constitution.' p. 18.

Now what is the 'right,' which this writer is thankful that the Constitution has secured to certain churches? Simply the exclusive right of electing teachers for the religious society of which they are members, of contracting with them for their support, that is, fixing their salaries, and of *levying taxes* of their own authority to pay the minister! Yes; it is true, however incredible it may seem, that this writer, after declaring the right of the parish to elect its teacher a *natural* one,—after declaring that the Constitution had annulled the right of the church to impose a teacher on a society, without their consent, and his *willingness* that it should be so, desires to thank God, that many churches have an opposing, and consequently an *unnatural* right, and may exercise it whenever they please! But there is nothing surprising in all this. There is no inconsistency in this conduct of Exclusive Christians, which could be deemed new on their part. Have we not seen Dr Beecher, in the Groton Result, praising the concurrent right of choice provided in the act of 1693, as the happiest and most glorious expedient to reconcile church and state, while he knew that his own church had not only excluded all *non-church members*, to all future time, from any voice in the election of their teachers, but had bound down the *church itself* to certain doctrines, of which not they, but other churches were to be the arbiters? Our country, in the course of its history, has exhibited many anomalous and unaccountable opinions and actions. Fleeing from religious persecution, our forefathers became, for a time, as arrant persecutors as any in Christendom. But we have never before exhibited an example so absurd, one so opposed to the spirit of the age, to the general light which has broken in upon the darkest portions of the globe, as the invention of Trust Deeds for the churches of Boston, clustered as they are around Fanueil Hall,

the cradle of civil freedom. Is it that the world has been mistaken in its doctrines on this subject, and that religious tyranny in fact flourishes best in a soil adapted to the growth of civil liberty? We are indeed perplexed at the present appearance of our old republic. We see men walking the streets with erect fronts, and manly appearance, who have surrendered forever, for themselves and children, the right to give a vote, as to the teacher who is to guide their steps through a world of temptations, to a better and eternal one; and yet, if you should ask such men if they would accept the deed of a house, on condition that they should always vote for the mayor, common council men, or governor whom the grantor should select, they might be guilty of a breach of the peace towards the person who should make them a proposition so degrading to their natural rights, and their personal dignity. We have, we must confess, been wholly at loss to reconcile this entire readiness to surrender the rights of conscience, to put on the livery of religious slavery, to be marked on the forehead as bought men, bound to pay such sums as the church members not chosen by themselves should assess, and for the support of men in whose election they had not any voice, with that generous spirit of freedom, that necessary jealousy of incroachment, which is so marked in our characters as freemen. We are not at all surprised, however, at the conduct of the authors of the Groton Result. It is their sincere belief, we have no doubt, that they ought to govern the State, and they can only effect this through the church, which constitutes their force, and is entirely at their command.

Quitting these disgusting exhibitions of the effects of human passions, let us examine the constitutional provision by the rules by which all laws and constitutional requirements are ordinarily construed. The committee, who reported the Constitution, proposed that it should be obligatory on all towns, parishes, and precincts within the Commonwealth, to provide for the support of religious worship. When this provision was under consideration, an amendment was moved and carried in the following terms; 'Provided, notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.'

It is a rule in the construction of all laws and constitutional provisions, that where they are plain and unambiguous, they are to be construed by themselves, but where they are ambiguous, reference may be had to the previous existing laws or usages to

construe them. Now in pursuance of this rule we may safely say, that there is no ambiguity whatever in the expressions of this important proviso. But it is contended by the advocates for the rights of the churches, that this clause was not meant to change, in any manner, the relations between churches and the civil corporations, with which they had been for one hundred and fifty years intimately connected. If this had been the intention, we ask, why they did not provide, in terms as short and simple as those which they adopted, 'that the churches and parishes should continue *respectively* to exercise and enjoy the powers and privileges which they had respectively exercised under the law of 1693?' Or if they, without any possible apparent reason, chose to substitute other terms, giving to the parishes an *exclusive* right in the most emphatical language, why did they not insert a proviso, 'reserving to the churches their accustomed right to lead in the choice,' if such had been their purpose? Or, if they intended to abolish the concurrent mode of choice and to substitute in its place the truly belligerent provision of an exclusive right in each, why did they not adopt a more precise expression than that of 'bodies politic, or religious societies?' It would have been much shorter and more clear to have said 'churches,' a name by which our writer pretends they were recognised as bodies politic. We should then have escaped the evils of this pretended misconstruction by so many learned Judges, who never heard of churches as bodies politic. It must therefore be admitted that the clause was most carelessly expressed by Governor Strong, if his design was to secure to the churches, the privileges secured by the law of 1693.

We are, however, quite ready to admit, that if churches were then well known and understood to be *bodies politic*, they are within the provisions of the Constitution. And we are asked, in the quotation just made from the pamphlet under review, whether in the above recited proviso of the Constitution, there is anything '*inconsistent* with the *rights of the church?*' We answer, fearless of contradiction, Yes—the provision was *fatal* to the rights of the churches as they had enjoyed them from 1693. By the proviso of the Constitution, it is admitted by the author under review, that the parish had the exclusive right of electing the public teacher, and of contracting with him for life, and of raising taxes for his support. Till the statute of 1811, that is, for thirtyone years after the Constitution, this power included the right of the parish to *compel the members of the church*, even if it chose its own pastor, to contribute to the support of the minister *elected by the town*, to the extent of their whole real

and personal estate. It is therefore absurd to give such a construction to the Constitution as is contended for on the other side.

Nor is this all. Whatever bodies had a right to elect a teacher under the Constitution, had also by that provision, a right to *contract* with the teacher elect. We deny, that any church ever had the power to contract with a minister or pastor, as a church. We deny that the pastor ever had the power to sue upon such a contract made by the church, *eo nomine*. In the whole period of two hundred years, we challenge the advocates for this absurd opinion, to produce one case of such a contract, or of its enforcement by law. We go further; we deny that any church ever had or exercised the power by law to raise taxes on its members. This is a most important point in construing the meaning of a provision made by able lawyers and statesmen. They cannot be supposed to refer to a body, which had not the power to make a contract, or to enforce its performance upon its members, after it was made.

This fearless writer, however, who holds in such sovereign contempt the opinions of Chief Justice Parsons in relation to a provision of the Constitution at the enacting of which he was personally a party, maintains, that the churches were *bodies politic* in the meaning of the Constitution, and therefore, our objections notwithstanding, within its very terms. In attempting to prove this, he has been guilty of both a grammatical and a legal misconstruction of its terms. He seems to suppose, that the words 'bodies politic, or religious societies,' were not synonymous, but what the lawyers call *cumulative;* and he reads the provision as if it had been, 'towns, parishes, precincts, bodies politic, *and* religious societies,' instead of 'towns, parishes, precincts, *and* bodies politic, *or* religious societies.' This difference is not unimportant, nor is the objection a captious one. The true meaning of the clause is this; 'bodies politic *which are* religious societies.' The distinction was founded in good reason. It was not the intention of the framers of the Constitution to vest the right of electing religious teachers in all the *secular* corporations of the State, but to confine it to *religious* corporations, and if the writer of this criticism had been tolerably well acquainted with our history and laws, he never could have fallen into so pitiable a mistake. He would have known, that the term 'religious societies,' instead of being a loose definition of all societies for religious purposes, was in truth a strict, technical definition; for let us inform him of a fact, of which his whole work shows him to be profoundly ignorant, that much the largest portion of our religious societies have been incorporated by that

name, being sometimes called the 'First, or Second Congregational Societies,' and at other times denominated the 'First, or Second Religious Societies.' The framers of the Constitution had therefore in their view well known corporate bodies, and it never entered into the head of any well informed constitutional lawyer, that the term 'religious societies' ever meant anything but the well known and familiar bodies, so often incorporated by our laws.

There is one other important consideration connected with this question, and fully supporting the opinion of Chief Justice Parker, and of the other learned Judges. In the whole course of legislation on this subject, for a century past, no man ever thought of making any provision in any act of incorporation specially for the church. The religious society was incorporated often before any church was formed. It was understood, that every religious society necessarily had the power to organize its own church. Every man, familiar with our usages, well knows, that the right to gather a church was an appendage to the corporate power, and not, as these gentlemen pretend, that the church was a distinct corporate body, unconnected with the religious society.

Our author is not more happy in alluding to an opinion, thrown out by Chief Justice Parker, in the Dedham case, that 'churches may possibly be *religious societies under the statute of* 1811.' This incidental remark, instead of supporting the proposition for which it is cited, proves that the Chief Justice held the directly opposite opinion. If they had been duly incorporated societies, the remark would have been superfluous. Its purport was, that, although *not* incorporated, they might come within the provisions of the statute of 1811.

The author under review seems himself to be aware of the utter futility of all the arguments, which we have just refuted, and therefore proceeds to the only important point, to wit, that the churches were well known, and duly recognised corporate bodies. This point we are now to examine. His proofs are;—

'1. That the original churches of Massachusetts were gathered *according to law.* They were gathered with the consent and approbation of the civil powers. For several years after the beginning of the settlement, whenever a church was intended to be gathered, the approbation of the *magistrates* must be first obtained. And in 1641, a law was passed, giving free liberty to gather churches, with the approbation of the *magistrates* "and the elders of neighbour churches;" but in no other way. This certainly looks as though the churches were to be regarded as *legally* organized and established.' pp. 20, 21.

We fully agree, not only that this '*looks as though*,' but that

it proves, that churches were legally organized and established; but how it shows that they were corporate bodies we are unable to perceive. This must be proved by some better evidence. Our author proceeds;—

'2. The churches in Massachusetts, or rather their members, were for many years entrusted with *great civil power*. From 1631, until 1662, none were entitled to the right of *suffrage*, or could be chosen or appointed to any *office*, who were not members of some regularly established church. The churches, therefore, for more than thirty years, had the power of excluding any person in the country from any office, and even from exercising the rights of a freeman.—Is it possible that bodies possessing so much power were not regarded as *bodies politic*—bodies recognized and incorporated by the laws?' p. 21.

We have too much respect for the understandings of our readers to make any other reply to this logical argument than to say, that all which it proves, is, that the churches had power to admit members, and that those members were wicked enough to secure to themselves, by law, the whole power of administering the government; but not in the character of church members—not as a church. We now come to the author's overwhelming argument.

'3. We have evidence that in the early settlement of Massachusetts, the churches exercised *parochial* authority. They had similar corporate powers to those which *parishes* now exercise. What is now a *precinct* or *parish*? "A precinct or parish," says Chief Justice Parker, "is a corporation established *solely for the purpose of maintaining public worship*, and their powers are *limited to that object*. They may raise money for building and keeping in repair their meetinghouse, and supporting their minister, but for *no other purpose*." But there is evidence that the churches, in the early settlement of this Commonwealth, exercised all the power here ascribed to parishes. They built and owned the first meetinghouses, and had the power of levying and collecting money for this object. In 1640, says Gov. Winthrop, "the church of Boston (the CHURCH) were necessitated to build a new meetinghouse, and a great difference arose about the place of situation, which had much troubled other churches, on the like occasion; but after some debate, it was referred to a committee, and was quietly settled. It cost about one thousand pounds, which was raised out of the weekly voluntary contribution, without any noise or complaint; when, in some *other* CHURCHES, which did it by way of *rates*, there was much difficulty and *compulsion by levies*, to raise a far less sum."

'The churches, at this period, had the power of raising money by tax for the *support of their pastors*. Says Gov. Winthrop again, in 1642, "the *churches* held a different course, in raising the minister's maintenance. Some did it by way of *taxation*, which was very offensive to some. Amongst others, one Briscoe, of Watertown, being grieved with this course in that town, the rather *because himself and others, who were* NO MEMBERS, *were taxed*, wrote a book against it," &c. From the latter part of this quotation, we learn that the word church is here used in its proper sense, as including only *members in covenant*—that the church, in this sense, had the power of *levying and collecting a tax*, for the support of its minister—that the power thus exercised was not mere church

power, as it extended to those who were *not members*, and consequently that it must have been conferred by some *provision* or *enactment of the General Court.*

'These conclusions are all confirmed by Hubbard's account of the same affair. "About this time, some difference happened in New England about the way of raising the maintenance of the ministers, in regard that many CHURCHES proceeded therein rather by way of *taxation*, than by contribution. This new way of easement was offensive to some in the country. Amongst others, it was very grievous to one Briscoe, a tanner, of Watertown; for this man published a book against the way of maintenance, wherein himself, and *those that were* NO MEMBERS, *were taxed* to maintain the ministers of the place they belonged unto. He was convened before the court to answer for his reproachful speeches; but for his arguments, they were not worth the answering; for he that shall deny the exerting of the *civil power* to provide for the comfortable subsistence of them that preach the Gospel, *juste potius erudiendus quam argumento.*"' pp. 21, 22.

From this quotation our vindicator makes the following triumphant, but illogical deduction.

'What was matter of inference from Winthrop's account is here expressly recorded,—that the *churches* were authorized by "the *civil power*" to collect taxes of their members and *others* for the support of ministers; or, in other words, that they were *parochial corporations.*' p. 22.

This is what Hubbard does not say, and so far from its being a fair inference from what he does say, a prudent, careful, logical reasoner, would have made an inference diametrically opposite, as we shall now proceed to show, and this inference would have been the *true one*, as we shall demonstrably prove. '*Ne sutor ultra crepidam*,' must be familiar to our vindicator of the rights of the churches, though he has neglected to avail himself of the salutary admonition. We have quoted his only plausible argument at full length, in order that we might make his refutation more complete. When an ignorant, or half informed man, undertakes to call in question the opinions of learned jurists, on legal questions, he should recollect that he is steering a bark amidst shoals and quicksands, without the benefit of a chart. It is not surprising, therefore, that he has met with a most desolating shipwreck.

First, then, it should have occurred to him from the two passages quoted from Winthrop and Hubbard, that the practice of taxation by churches, even if it had existed, which it never did, was not general. Winthrop gently reproves it, and Hubbard admits that there were great dissensions. How then could our learned vindicator draw the bold inference 'that the power must have been conferred by some *provision* or *enactment* of the General Court?' If it had been so authorised, the practice would have been universal. So far for his logic. We make a few remarks for his instruction, should he ever again undertake the perilous task of writing on law subjects.

First, it is not certain, that when these historians, who were not law reporters, used the word 'churches,' they did not use them in the popular sense, meaning the religious societies. Thus a man in writing the annals of 1828, might well say, 'This year Trinity Church voted to pull down its old wooden edifice, and erect a splendid Gothic stone building on its site.'

Secondly, why did it not occur to the writer, that his authorities proved too much; that they proved the churches to have the power of taxation, and that, as this power has never been repealed, they must have it now?

Thirdly, did the writer never hear, that *corporations* may be dissolved in various ways, one of which is by neglect, or *non usu*? Now as his last citation to prove corporate acts on the part of churches, bears date in 1642, there has been a chasm, or *lacune* of evidence, of one hundred and eightysix years, so that this prescriptive right, which never existed, except in the writer's own imagination, is gone forever, and was gone in 1780, so that they were not then bodies politic, and capable of taking the benefit of the proviso.

But lastly, we can set at entire rest this gentleman's mind on this topic. Hubbard and Winthrop never intended to say that the ecclesiastical body, called a church, ever exercised this power. Having been from early life conversant with our early records, and knowing, that within one or two years after the landing of our ancestors, they carefully kept the civil and ecclesiastical power distinct, though they were too much influenced by the priesthood, we were satisfied that the vindicator wholly misunderstood Hubbard and Winthrop. We therefore desired a learned friend to examine into the Watertown case, *which is the only one cited by this writer*. The result is as follows. In the town records of Watertown, in 1642, the year cited, is the following entry.

'Ordered, that there shall be a rate made of £100, for to discharge these debts following.'

Then, after mentioning several debts, it mentions the following appropriations.

'To John Knolles, paster for 1 quarter—£10.

'To George Phillips, paster for half a year due Jan. 1, £33. 6. 8.'

Mr Phillips and Mr Knolles were then united in the work of the ministry in Watertown.

To get rid of any pretence, that this might be a church meeting, we subjoin two other articles which put that question at rest. The record preceding the one above cited, is as follows;—'These nine freemen chosen to order the *town* affairs for this year, to wit, Edward How, Thomas Mayhew, &c.' and the very record which we have cited, begins thus;—'Ordered that George Mannings and Hugh Mason are appointed by the Towne to packe and sell leather according to the order of the Court.' It will not be

pretended that these were ecclesiastical subjects. To show, that the practice of taxing for the support of the ministers by the *town* was continued, we make the following extract from Watertown records.

'At a general town meeting the 16(7), 1648, the towne granted to Paster Knowles and Paster Sherman 120 pounds for the year following to be equally divided between them—the said sum to be *raised by rate made by the seven men*,' i. e. Selectmen.

This was *four years* before towns were compelled by law, to support their ministers, and during the very period when our author fancied that the churches exercised parochial power. We presume that we have disabused him of his error, and that hereafter he will have more respect for men whose profession and duty it is to investigate our early history and laws.—We think we may now safely dismiss the question of the *corporate* character of our early churches.

The vindicator of the rights of the churches, however, was not more fortunate in alluding to the First Church in Boston. Governor Winthrop says, that when this church was about to erect a new edifice, there was much dispute, as usual, about its situation, but it finally issued in erecting it on the site of the old one near the market; that it cost one thousand pounds, and was paid for out of the *weekly contributions*. The whole history of this church, from its origin to this hour, fully confirms the opinions of the learned Judges in the Dedham case; to wit, that churches were considered as necessarily associated with the parochial bodies of which they formed a part, and that property granted to them, was considered as granted, in trust, for the use and benefit of the whole society or congregation.

First, as to the land on which the church was erected, it was the property of the inhabitants of the town, and held under their permission or grant. We need not prove this point, so familiar to every Suffolk lawyer. The church itself was erected out of the weekly contributions; that is, by the whole congregation. When the second edifice was burnt down, in 1711, it was rebuilt by *subscription*. So far, then, the whole congregation had an equal equitable interest in the property, and the subsequent events show that such was the understanding both of the church and congregation. For one hundred years, the church arranged all ecclesiastical, and all prudential concerns; but in 1731, ninety-seven years since, it being thought proper to raise the ministers' salaries, we find that a meeting of the *church and congregation* was called to consider that subject, and the celebrated Elisha Cooke, the popular leader of that day, and himself a church member,

submitted to this joint meeting, a resolution to increase the salaries, and to raise them by *contribution*. From that day till the year 1785, the affairs of that society were arranged in *joint* meeting of church and congregation, and what is still more curious, the church record book became the record book of *church and congregation*. Since 1785, the parish have kept a separate record, and the deacons and parish committee have disposed of the old church, have erected dwellinghouses and leased them, on land bought by the church for the use of its pastor, and have lately sold part of the same land for a schoolhouse. Will it be said that this was usurpation, a disseizin of the church? We answer, No. It was the result of a conviction and knowledge that the property belonged to the whole religious society; and, at any rate, it proves that the First Church had ceased to act as a corporate body, if ever it so acted, which we deny, long before the Constitution of 1780, and could not, therefore, come within the disputed proviso.*

We shall only refer to the history of the Brattle Street Church, and of the church in Summer Street, for the purpose of showing what was the spirit and understanding of the people of this State one hundred years ago. The Brattle Street society was formed by an association of respectable men, who bought the land and erected an edifice for public worship *before they gathered their church*. The same was true of the Summer Street society. There is no pretence that in either of these cases, the church had any title to the estate. There were many other societies of the same description in the Commonwealth, and the clause of the proviso in the Constitution referred to such 'religious societies' as were neither towns, parishes, nor precincts, and therefore it became necessary to define them as 'bodies politic or religious societies.' The churches associated with other legal, well recognised corporate bodies, such as towns, parishes, and precincts, never could have entered into the minds of such lawyers as composed the Convention of 1780, as bodies politic or religious societies. If such are the undoubted facts, proveable by authentic records, as to the origin and the views of our ancestors, in relation to the Boston churches, which from the commencement were erected and supported by subscriptions and weekly contributions of the whole congregation or worshipping members, how much stronger, how infinitely stronger, indeed, is the case of the country societies, who, unable, as the early historians say, and as we know them to have been, from

* The Proprietors of the First Church are now applying for an act of incorporation.

that day to the present, to erect churches and support teachers by voluntary contributions, have always, in all times, from 1642, when we prove it to be true in the case of Watertown, built churches and supported religious teachers by taxation voted in town meetings, or, after parishes were erected, in parish meetings?

The author in question, criticising the opinions of the Supreme Court, says, that parishes were not held by law to support religious teachers till 1652, and therefore infers that the churches till that time supported them. The consequence does not follow. The towns voluntarily made grants of lands for parochial purposes, and laid taxes for the support of public worship, long before any act had passed compelling them so to do. On the same principle, many and most societies since the adoption of the Constitution, have permitted as an act of courtesy the churches to lead in the election of religious teachers, without any fear that such an indulgence could ever be construed into the relinquishment of a constitutional right, which it was not in their power to surrender, though they might, *pro hac vice*, in the case in hand, yield it to the church on the ground of the antiquity of the usage.

We have now closed our argument on the ground of *historical evidence*, and we shall conclude the whole by a recapitulation of some points contained in our review of the Groton Result, to which no reply has been, and, as we believe, no reply ever will be made.

First, the statute of 1754, incorporating, in certain cases, the minister and deacons, and in other cases the deacons only, is conclusive proof that churches were *not incorporated before*. If they had been corporate bodies the act was wholly superfluous. The pretence that the incorporation of the deacons was in truth the incorporation of the church, is too absurd to need refutation. As a test, and a very simple one, of its absurdity, if the church, at a church meeting, should vote the sale of shares in a bank granted to the deacons, and give a conveyance of them, the deacons would not be bound by such vote, and the conveyance would be utterly void. Therefore, the deacons, and not the church, were the corporation.

Secondly, by the statute of 1800, the *privileges* of all churches which are associated with any town, parish, precinct, body politic, or religious society, are confirmed and established. This statute, it is pretended, confirms the rights of all churches to elect their teacher, on the ground, that they are bodies politic or religious societies. On this statute we remark, that its words confirm the opinion of the Court, that churches were necessarily

connected with corporate bodies, and were not so considered themselves; that penalties were inflicted on all the corporate bodies therein mentioned for neglecting to elect and support religious teachers; that this clause clearly applied to towns, parishes, and precincts, and that it would be most unreasonable to subject them to such a penalty, when, by the construction given on the other side, they could not fulfil the condition. It is most absurd to say that both the parish and church of the same place were subject to this penalty, and yet that absurd consequence would follow from the principles set up by the vindicator of the right of the churches.

Lastly, we remarked what we deemed to be conclusive; that the statute of 1800 repealed all the previous laws existing on the subject. Of course, the statute of 1693, if it had not been destroyed by the proviso of the Constitution, fell by this law.

We have now only to ask the pardon of our readers for dwelling so long on a work so replete with unfounded assertions, inconclusive reasoning, and breathing a spirit so revolting to every man who has the least pretensions to good breeding, correct morals, or christian benevolence. Of this we are convinced, and we have long felt it, that no good can possibly be done to any cause, by works of this character. The divisions between the two parties of Congregationalists may be made more wide by them, and the hope of reconciliation, at least of christian fellowship and kindness, more desperate. But if the object of the writers be conviction to the minds of those who differ from them, or the gaining over proselytes from the great mass who have never entered into the controversy, never were men more mistaken. Their defeat and disgrace is inevitable. Touching the pretended object of this pamphlet, for its real purpose is very different from its ostensible one, the writer ought not to hope for success. There is not, probably, an Orthodox town in the State, that would vote that the church had corporate powers, or ought to have a right to an absolute vote in the election of the minister or pastor. No; this is not the object. It is only one of the thousand efforts which are now making, to excite a theological or religious enthusiasm, and by its means to restore a tyranny over the minds of laymen, the loss of which to priests of certain sects of Pharisaical pretensions, is as galling as the simple doctrines of the despised teacher of Nazareth were to the high priests and scribes of Jerusalem.

ART XIII.—1. *The Future Punishment of Infants not a Doctrine of Calvinism; 2. The Future Punishment of Infants never a Doctrine of the Calvinistic Churches; 3. On the Future State of Infants;—three Letters addressed 'To the Editor of the Christian Examiner,' and published in 'The Spirit of the Pilgrims' for January, February, and March.* By the Rev. LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Boston. Pierce & Williams. 1828. 8vo. pp. 43.

[Continued from p. 340.]

THE next of our authorities noticed by Dr Beecher, is Bellamy, the friend and disciple of Edwards, recommended by him, as we have already remarked, as 'manifesting the mutual dependence of the various parts of *the true scheme of religion*,' and by Drs Miller, Morse, Griffin, Woods, Mr Stuart, &c. &c., for similar reasons. But what a wonderful sameness of sentiment is manifested on this subject, not only by all Calvinists we have quoted, except two, but by all Calvinists whatever, from the time of the founder of the sect to the present hour. With the two exceptions we shall soon notice, they all, to a man, believe just as Dr Beecher believes, and just as much as he believes, and no more—a coincidence unexampled in the history, we will not say of sectarists, but of man. How easy, too, is the task which our author seems to think is all he has to perform in this controversy! With our reasoning, though he admits it to be 'an attempt to reason for the edification of readers who are blessed with common sense,' he appears to think *he* has nothing to do. He therefore transcribes our quotations, or rather such parts of them as are not fully to our purpose, and if the doctrine of infant damnation is not contained in them *in so many words*, his work he considers done. Thus in the case of Bellamy, as in that of Turretin, he copies most, but not all, of what we cited from that writer, and then tells us, what we very well knew before, that 'he nowhere, in *these* quotations, *expresses* the opinion that infants are lost,' taking no notice of what he must have known we principally relied upon to prove that the doctrine is evidently and undeniably *implied* in those and the omitted quotations taken together, though that would be as decisive of Bellamy's *belief* on the subject, as his most direct assertion could be. Of the three first passages from this writer, one, as we said, was quoted, 'principally because it was short, and because it was so *striking*,' and the other two we adduced for the pur-

pose of proving just what Dr Beecher admits them to prove, and no more; viz.

'1. That infants,' to use his own words, 'as the subjects of original sin, are depraved, born spiritually dead.

'2. That if they should die, and go into eternity with this depraved nature, they could not be admitted to heaven, and would be wicked and miserable.' p. 91.

It was from the succeeding quotations that we inferred Bellamy's belief in the actual damnation of infants, as was evident from the manner in which we introduced and commented upon them, which was thus;—

'*This being the case*, he anticipates and states the objection; "But if mankind are thus, by nature, children of wrath in a state of being worse than not to be, and, *even after all that Christ has done*, are in themselves thus utterly undone, how can men have the heart to propagate their kind?"

'As to *godly* parents, they have such a spirit of love to God, and resignation to his will, and such an approbation of his dispensations towards mankind, and such a liking to his whole scheme of government, that they are content that God should govern the world as he does; and that he should have subjects to govern; and that themselves and their posterity should be under him, and at his disposal. Nor are they without hopes of mercy for their children, from sovereign grace through Christ, while they do, through him, devote and give them up to God, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. And thus they quiet themselves as to their souls.' *

'The meaning of the writer evidently is, that if children are baptized and BROUGHT UP in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, there are some hopes of mercy for them; godly parents may be "*not without hopes.*" As respects other children, the children of such who are not godly parents, and especially those children who die as infants, Bellamy suggests none whatever. He does not intimate a possibility that they may escape everlasting torments.' †

Now Dr Beecher takes no notice whatever of the question in reply to which this passage from Bellamy was written, though we placed it distinctly before him, and though it has so important and so decisive a bearing upon the point at issue. We admit that the writer, 'does not *say*, that there is no hope for the children of believers who die in infancy;' and that he 'does not *say*, that there is no hope for the children of unbelievers dying in infancy, or that they are sent to hell.' But neither does he *say*, that for such children there *is* hope, or that they will *not* be sent to hell; and his not saying so in his circumstances, is to our minds irresistible evidence that, in consistency with his Calvinistic convictions, he could not say so, and that, if he had said anything upon the subject, he must have expressed it as his opinion that at least the infants of

* Bellamy's Works, vol. i. p. 336. † Christian Examiner, vol. iv. p. 445.

ungodly men will be damned. He answers the question, 'How can men have the heart to propagate their kind?' in a way which shows that the objection he had in his mind, was, that they might thus be the means of bringing into existence beings who would inevitably perish everlastingly. It would have gone far to remove this objection had he said that all such children as die in infancy, will be saved; and he has shown that he would have made this reply if he could, by adopting it in relation to the children of 'godly persons,' though even for them he did not dare to open the doors of salvation wider than to assure us that such are 'not without hopes.' But of 'carnal men,' as he calls them below, he remarks, that 'as soon as ever they enter into the eternal world, and see how things really are,' they 'will no doubt wish themselves to be from under God's government and *hate, that he should ever have any thing of their's to govern.*' Now the 'things of theirs,' of which Bellamy is speaking, are their children, infants not excepted. But if in the 'eternal world,' these 'carnal men' see their children, not in a state of misery, but of happiness, what in God's mode of governing them can they possibly 'hate?'

But lest Dr Beecher should tell us that Bellamy, in the passage just noticed, was speaking only of such children as grow up, and has '*said*' nothing of infants, as such, we quoted still another passage, against which no such cavil could be raised.

'It was at God's sovereign election,—to give every child of Adam born in a christian land, *opportunity, by living*, to hear the glad tidings, or only to grant this to some, while *others die in infancy, and never hear.* Those who die in infancy, may as justly be held under law in the next world, as those that live may in this. God is under no more obligations to save those that die, than he is to save those that live; to grant the regenerating influences of his spirit to them, than he is to these.'*

Now here Bellamy does 'say' something about infants, and puts those of them who die in infancy upon the very same footing with such as live and grow up. This is all we ask. Both election and reprobation, must, upon all acknowledged principles of Calvinism, take place among them as well as among others. All who contend that infants dying in infancy will be saved, or even that it is uncertain what will become of them, do, and must, make a distinction between them and the rest of mankind. Dr Beecher must himself do so, though in direct opposition to an unquestionably genuine and essential doctrine of Calvinism, which teaches that God's election is particular, personal, and unconditional, having respect to individuals, not to nations or classes. But Bellamy, it seems, was content with his

* Bellamy's Works, vol. ii. pp. 369, 370.

system as Calvin and Edwards had expounded it, though with the former he must 'precipitate into eternal death harmless babes torn from their mothers' breasts,' or with the latter, 'conceive of poor little infants suffering eternal misery for Adam's sin.' *

The only other names introduced into the article to which Dr Beecher's Letters were written in reply, were those of Gale, Boston, Twiss, and Gill. The citation from Boston, probably because it was short, pointed, and to the purpose, Dr Beecher has seen fit to pass over in silence. Yet Boston is one of the most popular of all the expositors of Calvinism, and not only a wholly unobjectionable, but a very important authority.

Gale was not quoted as holding the doctrine of infant damnation, as the explicitness with which we stated the purpose for which he *was* quoted, compels us to believe Dr Beecher must himself have well known, though he is at no small pains to give his readers an impression to the contrary. We quoted him as maintaining the same principles in regard to God's absolute justice as were maintained by Twiss, and for nothing else. Our language was as follows;—

'The principles maintained by Twiss, in the passage quoted from him in respect to God's justice, and its consistency with his character to inflict eternal torments upon an innocent being whom he has created, exclude still more strongly any ground upon which an exception can be made in favor of infants, thoroughly depraved as they are, with original sin, so as

* After his summary of what is taught in our citations from Bellamy, our author remarks as follows;—'He [Bellamy] nowhere, in these quotations, expresses the opinion that infants are lost; for we have shewn it to have been the common opinion of the Reformers, so happily expressed by Dickinson, the cotemporary of Bellamy, that some infants are elected certainly; viz. the children of believers, dying in infancy. Yet there is no "evidence from Scripture or the nature of things, that any of these [infants] will eternally perish. All those that die in infancy may, for aught we know, belong to the election of grace, and be predestinated to the adoption of children."'—There, we should be glad to have 'turned into syllogisms' reasoning like that. 'We have shewn it to have been the common opinion of the Reformers, so happily expressed by Dickinson, the cotemporary of Bellamy, that some infants are elected certainly; and there is no evidence from Scripture or the nature of things that any of these [infants] will eternally perish.' *Therefore*, irresistibly argues Dr Beecher, '*he* [Bellamy] nowhere, in these quotations, expresses the opinion that infants are lost!' We have here the major and conclusion, it is true. Where the connecting proposition is to be found, we are utterly at a loss to determine. Besides, where has Bellamy '*expressed*' the opinion 'so happily expressed by Dickinson?' Not in our quotations, most certainly; yet, says our author, those quotations are nothing to our purpose, because they do not '*express* the opinion that infants are lost,' though he seems to think them abundantly to *his* purpose when what he says they teach is just as much a matter of inference as that which we contend they teach! For 'the edification' of what kind of 'readers' did Dr Beecher 'attempt to reason' here? The truth is, with all his parade of 'premises,' 'conclusions,' 'syllogisms,' 'skill in logic,' &c. &c., Dr Beecher is decidedly among the least accurate of all reasoners and writers, we recollect to have met with. Instances of false argument almost as gross as that we have just exposed, are to be found on almost any page of the Letters before us.

to afford any hope that their lot may be better than that of the rest of their species. But these are the principles of Calvin, and have been as broadly maintained by some of the most distinguished among his followers as they are by Twiss. They seem indeed to be essential to the system. The learned Theophilus Gale, the author of a book once very famous, the Court of the Gentiles, says;

'"So great is the Majestie of God, and so Absolute his Dominion, as that he is obnoxious to no Laws, Obligations, or Ties from his Creature: this Absolute justice or Dominion regards not any qualities or condition of its object; but God can by virtue hereof inflict the highest torments on his innocent Creature, and exempt from punishment the most *nocent*. By this Absolute Justice and Dominion God can inflict the greatest torments, even of Hel itself, on the most innocent Creature."'*

Such are the words of Theophilus Gale. But Dr Beecher thinks he could not have meant as he said, and that in his case, as in that of Calvin, 'the memory of the illustrious dead has been blackened with calumny.' For, says he—

'Having perceived the mistakes of the reviewer in translation,' [*absque remedio* is the unlucky phrase to which our author alludes] 'we thought it due to the memory of a "learned" and good man, "the author of a book once very famous," to examine whether the extract gave us, not the "truth" only, but "the whole truth." On turning to Gale, our astonishment was never surpassed.' pp. 93, 94.

And what was it that so 'surpassingly astonished' our learned author? Why, 'in the first place, his [Gale's] views of what he calls absolute justice are not fully explained by the reviewer.' But what was there astonishing in that? Had not Dr Beecher already shown 'with what limited knowledge of his subject, and with what unauthorised confidence, he [the reviewer] had spoken of the sentiments of Calvin,' and ought it to have filled him with wonder that he should have committed a blunder with respect to the sentiments of any other writer? But Gale's views of absolute justice are not fully explained by the reviewer, and Dr Beecher is 'astonished;' and under the influence, doubtless, of this bewilderment, he gives us Gale's account of '*ordinate* justice,' which is quite a different thing, and with which the reviewer did not profess to have anything to do—and that too, accompanied with an explanation of God's 'absolute justice,' quite as revolting as any the most offensive interpretation which can be put upon Gale's language in the passage we quoted. Truly his astonishment *must* have been great. 'By his absolute justice and dominion, God,' says Gale, in his own words, and according to the reviewer, 'can inflict the greatest torments, even of hell itself, on the most innocent creature.'. And, asserts Gale, according to Dr Beecher, 'all whom God creates *may* be dealt with, in respect to happiness or misery, for the general good,

* Christian Examiner, vol. iv. p. 441.—Court of the Gentiles, Part IV. Book II. Chap. vi. § 1.

without any reference to character.' Surely, 'the reviewer,' Dr Beecher himself being judge, did 'indeed misrepresent Gale as flagrantly as Professor Norton mistranslated Calvin;' the one rendering Calvin's Latin according to Calvin's French, and the other interpreting Gale's English according to the obvious meaning of Gale's words. Between that justice which '*can* inflict the greatest torments, even of hell itself, on the most innocent creature,' and that justice which '*may* deal with God's creatures, in respect to happiness and misery, *without any reference to character*,' we too shall be 'astonished' when we discover the difference. But Dr Beecher proceeds;—

'In view of this exhibition, I remark,

'That the reviewer has misrepresented Gale as flagrantly as Professor Norton has mistranslated Calvin. He has quoted his ideas of absolute justice in a manner so insulated and unexplained, as makes his unqualified language more alarming and offensive than his real meaning. He has also given Gale's ideas of absolute justice in such a manner as implies that it is the rule by which God actually administers his moral government. And he has produced the glaring passage to prove the doctrine of infant damnation; when, from the whole connexion, it is perfectly manifest, that Gale had, in his own mind, no reference to that subject whatever.'

pp. 94, 95.

Passing over the 'flagrant mistranslation' of *absque remedio*, to which Dr Beecher so often attracts the attention of his readers, we remark, that, except perhaps in the last clause, there is not a word of truth in this whole extract. That Gale may have had no reference to the damnation of infants in the 'glaring passage' we quoted, is admitted. But that we produced that passage for the purpose Dr Beecher alleges, we again deny. Nor did we give Gale's ideas of absolute justice as if that kind of justice were the rule of God's moral government, though Dr Beecher may yet be 'astonished' to find, that, in the most signal act of that government, Gale himself represents the Deity as administering punishment according to the very 'ideas' which Dr Beecher thinks so 'alarming and offensive.' Neither, again, is Gale's unqualified language different in any respect from his real meaning. The extract gives his views clearly and correctly, and no more. We defy any one to show from the context that his language requires any qualification whatever. The principles he was laying down had been maintained as broadly by thousands before, and so they have been since—a fact of which no one at all 'conversant with the most approved Calvinistic writers' need be informed. Gale therefore had no occasion to 'explain' or 'qualify' his words, either because what he was saying might be 'alarming and offensive,' or because it was novel, difficult to be understood, or in danger of passing for more than he intended.

Still, Dr Beecher's 'astonishment' at our mode of citing this author, 'was never surpassed.' But we should not be astonished at all, if a bold, half informed dealer in hap-hazard assertions, who 'does not stand about trifles,' should commit himself as grossly as Dr Beecher has done on this subject. Even his hitherto 'unsurpassed astonishment' must, we think, be exceeded, when we inform him, that in the very paragraph from which we quoted the 'alarming and offensive' passage in question, Gale writes thus;—

'There is no justice properly so termed in respect of the Creatures, whereby God stands obliged to them, antecedent to the constitution of his own Wil. Nothing more unjust than to deny unto God an absolute Dominion to dispose of the Creature made by him as it pleaseth him. And that GOD DID *de facto* INFLICT THE HIGHEST TORMENTS ON AN INNOCENT PURE SPOTLESS CREATURE, EVEN THE HUMAN NATURE OF HIS OWN SON is most evident.'*

Now 'in view of this exhibition,' we would inquire whether the 'accredited organ' of any party ever brought himself into a predicament more awkward than that in which our author now stands. Here is a doctrine which lies at the foundation of his whole system, and he not only pronounces it 'alarming and offensive,' but is exceedingly shocked, or rather 'surpassingly astonished,' that a plain statement of a leading principle involved in it, should be so cited as to imply a belief that the author of that statement was in earnest when he wrote 'the glaring passage' which contains it! From a Unitarian, who looks with horror upon the light in which the Calvinistic doctrine of atonement puts the character of God, language like this might have been expected. But we confess we were not prepared to hear it from the lips of Dr Beecher, an Orthodox man and a Calvinist. From him we should have looked for a panegyric rather than a satire upon the glorious 'scheme of redemption.' He was taken at unawares we admit. But this only the more strongly confirms what we have always maintained in regard to Calvinistic views of the character of God; viz. that they are utterly revolting to all the better principles of our nature, and, to an unprejudiced mind, carry their own refutation with them. Our author was in a state of astonishment—a state which does not afford the best of opportunities for the heart to hold close council with the head, and he therefore uttered the honest language of his feelings before he had consi dered how completely at war it was with the language of his system; and his testimony is a thousand times the more valuable for its very undesignedness. We

* Court of the Gentiles, Part IV. B. II. chap. vi. §1.

might enlarge upon this topic, but it is high time to return to our subject.

For the vindication, and, as we think, the thorough vindication of our original article, it only remains for us to notice Dr Beecher's objections to the authorities of Drs Twiss and Gill, whose language is too direct and explicit to be evaded, even by our author's acknowledged adroitness at starting and managing a sophism. These writers, he is constrained to admit, do teach the 'monstrous doctrine, that infants are damned.' But as to Twiss, 'though held in high estimation in his day,' and though Prolocutor of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, he 'belonged to the class of Calvinists denominated Supralapsarian,' and Dr Beecher, it seems, 'never heard him referred to, as authority in any case, by his theolgical instructer.' Dr Dwight, however, the 'theological instructer' referred to, was unquestionably possessed of some theological learning. *He*, therefore, would have no more thought of disputing whether the doctrine of infant damnation had been held by approved Calvinistic writers, than of making it a question whether the Roman Catholics ever believed in the real presence of Christ, or the spiritual supremacy of the pope; and as to authority for it, he probably would have considered one Calvinist as good an authority as another, it being a 'matter of perfect notoriety' that Calvinists of all ages and of almost all descriptions, have believed and enforced it.

Neither is the value of Twiss's testimony at all diminished by the fact that he was a Supralapsarian. The 'monstrous doctrine' in question is no more a consequence of Supralapsarianism than of Sublapsarianism. These modifications of Calvinism relate solely to the dispute as to what was the object of predestination in the Divine Mind. They do not differ at all in respect to the distinction of mankind into elect and non-elect, or in regard to the principles upon which that distinction is made. Accordingly the doctrine of infant damnation has been held by Calvinists of both parties, as our quotations abundantly show. If Doctor Twiss was a Supralapsarian, Turretin, Boston, Watts, Edwards, and Bellamy, were Sublapsarians. The truth is that the attempt Dr Beecher now makes to disparage Twiss's authority, is only one of the miserable shifts to which he is driven by his reluctance to acknowledge the error of which he has been so plainly convicted. As a witness in this case Twiss is wholly unexceptionable. There is not a name upon the list of English controversialists of his day, which stands higher. One of the most distinguished of the champions of his party in their contests with the Arminians, there is hardly a respectable writer of that party

since his day, who has noticed him or his labors without commendation.

Equally lame are our author's objections to Dr Gill, with whom the chief fault he can find, is, that he was a Baptist, and that he 'leaned towards Antinomianism.' Still, we reply that Gill was a Calvinist, and in all essential respects a fair representative of the Calvinistic body. His believing in the necessity of immersion, implies no unsoundness of faith as to any one of the five points of his system, and if 'the tendency and actual influence of some of his opinions upon the churches of his denomination,' have been 'deprecated,' we should be glad to be informed whether it was not chiefly because of their too strictly Calvinistic character. His Commentary, from which we quoted, was certainly most highly commended by some twenty of the most distinguished members of his denomination, in this country, and by none more highly than by the very gentleman, who, as we are now told, 'deprecates the influence of some of his opinions.' * With all his objections to Gill as a Baptist, however, our author can speak very smoothly and complaisantly of 'his Rev. Brother, of the Baptist denomination,' when it happens to suit his purpose to do so. But why the Rev. Daniel Sharp should be a good witness for Dr Beecher, and Gill be an inadmissible one for us, because he belongs to the same class of Christians, we need our author's 'skill in logic' to discover. Till we are possessed of it, however, we shall still claim the right to insist on his authority in support of our charge against Calvinism and Calvinistic writers.

Having thus shown that every author we have quoted was really a believer in infant damnation, and that the only two whose authority in the case Dr Beecher disputes, are unexceptionable witnesses, we might here safely consider the whole controversy at an end. But Dr Beecher, in his reply, has not contented himself with 'showing that our proofs were nugatory,' and we are therefore compelled to tax the patience of our readers for a few pages more.

After quoting a passage from President Dickinson of Princeton, who says, that 'he does not know that the scripture anywhere assures us that infants shall all be saved,' and that 'there is not, that he knows of, any evidence, from scripture or the nature of things, that any of these will eternally perish,' and that 'it therefore concerns us, *without any bold and presumptuous conclusions*, to leave them in the hands of God,' Dr Beecher remarks;—

* 'Although I do not *entirely* agree with Dr Gill in every sentiment, yet I think his Exposition *by far the best of any extant in the English language!*' Dr Baldwin.

'In the same manner, according to Van Mastricht, the Reformers decided. Therefore he says "they (the reformers) thought certain infants might be exposed to reprobation, as they were exposed to (or the subjects of) original sin, Rom. v. 12, 14, as being unsanctified and impure, 1 Cor. vii. 14, and placed without the covenant of grace, Gen. xvii. 7, 8. Acts xi. 39. In the mean time, concerning the infants of the faithful, because they are called pure, 1 Cor. vii. 14, likewise in covenant, Acts, xi. 39. compared with Gen. xvii. 7, because also they are held as being parts of their parents, they judged more favorably. But the infants of unbelievers, because the scriptures determine nothing clearly on the subject, they supposed were to be left to the divine discretion.' p. 50.

This passage from Van Mastricht Dr Beecher considers a very important, if not a triumphant one. He refers to it again and again, and at every successive time apparently with increased satisfaction. No men make a greater figure in his pages than these Reformers. But the truth is, that neither did Van Mastricht have any such personages in view, nor does the passage quoted from him teach what Dr Beecher supposes. In the first place, Van Mastricht was not speaking of the Reformers. *Reformati* is the word in the original, and what schoolboy would not blush to make *Reformers* of that? From the context it appears that he uses this word, sometimes to distinguish the Protestants in general, from the Catholics and heretics, and at others to distinguish a certain class of Protestants, namely, the Calvinists, from the Lutherans. It is in the latter acceptation it should be taken in the passage before us. It is the Calvinists of whom Van Mastricht is here speaking under the appellation of *Reformati*, or the Reformed, as any one, even Dr Beecher himself, may satisfy himself by examining the original. Nor, in the second place, does this writer say of the Calvinists what Dr Beecher supposes, but, on the contrary, he declares just what we have always maintained, namely, that they are believers in actual infant damnation. His words, literally translated, are, 'They [the Reformed, as distinguished from the Lutherans, that is, the Calvinists] think that some infants may be obnoxious to reprobation, as obnoxious to original sin,' &c. There is nothing to indicate that the word 'obnoxious,' is not to be taken in the same sense in both clauses of the sentence, and Dr Beecher himself very properly takes it in the latter clause to mean, that infants are not only 'exposed to,' but the actual 'subjects of,' original sin, which no Calvinist ever doubted. This, we contend, is also the meaning of the word in the first clause; so that what Van Mastricht really asserts, is, that the Calvinists think that 'some infants are *the subjects of* reprobation, the same as they are the subjects of original sin.' If this was not his meaning, not only is the passage unfaithful to the truth of history, but the author contradicts himself. For, in answer to the

question, 'Whether original sin deserves only the punishment of loss,' he gives, in another place, first the opinions of the Pelagians and Socinians, next of the Catholics, and then, with a particular view to the case of infants, adds;—

'*Reformati*, the Reformed, think the punishment of sense inseparable from the punishment of loss, and therefore adjudge to it, [original sin,] not only the punishment of loss, but of sense.'

He proceeds to assign several reasons for this, of which the sixth is as follows;—

'Because the *limbus infantum* is nothing but an idle figment of the human brain, having no evidence either in reason or scripture.—But the Papists in vain endeavour to prove their doctrine, 1. From the milder punishment of infants, on account of their not being guilty of actual sin, when it is manifest, from Luc. xii. 47, that there are degrees of the punishment of sense.' *

Van Mastricht, then, instead of supporting the positions of our author, is directly opposed to them, and is an important authority for our own views of this subject, Dr Beecher himself being judge. Still, there were such men as the Reformers, and they had their opinions as to the future state of infants, though Van Mastricht, in Dr Beecher's favorite quotation, refers to neither the one nor the other. We promised, it is true, to speak fully on this subject, but our limits warn us to forbear. When the 'Reformers' are mentioned, the names that instantly occur are those of Luther, Malancthon, Zuingle, Calvin. Calvin, as we have seen, believed in infant damnation, and thought Servetus ought to be burnt for not believing it. Melancthon and Luther,† if we may believe the symbolical books of their church, which they had a chief hand in preparing, thought baptism necessary to salvation, and of course that such infants as die without it, must go to hell; and Zuingle, as is well known, was, on the article of original sin, a heretic. This is all we can now say of the Reformers, of whom Dr Beecher has said so much and so unadvisedly.

Though not, in the common acceptation of the word, 'a Reformer,' there is hardly a commentator of the age of Calvin, who is quoted oftener or with more respect than Zanchius. At the Synod of Dort especially, as we shall hereafter see, he was in high repute, and even during the heat of the controversy with the Arminian Methodists in the last century, the Rev. Augustus

* Van Mastricht, Theoretico-Pract. Theolog. Lib. iv. cap. ii.sec. 20.

† 'Gregorius Ariminensis, Driedo, *Luther*, *Melancthon*, and Tilmanus Heshusius, are fallen into the worst of St Austin's opinion, and sentence poor infants to the flames of hell for original sin, if they die before baptism.'—*Jeremy Taylor*, vol. ix. p. 91. Heber's Edit.

Toplady, the coarse champion of Orthodoxy against the Wesleyans, thought his treatise on predestination worthy of an English dress, and fit to enlighten the English public on that cardinal point of Calvinism. Yet Zanchius, in opposition to the same Catholic writer with whom we have already seen Calvin disputing, writes thus;—

'Says Pighius; "Infants are without actual sin. Therefore, although exiles from the kingdom of heaven, they will not be damned, nor receive any punishment of sense, except those of them who in the course of nature sin, either in their external or internal senses [*nisi etiam qui sensibus internis vel externis naturaliter peccant.*]"

'I answer. They are nevertheless wicked, and being born adapted to sin, ARE THEREFORE JUSTLY DAMNED, although they have not yet sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. For as temporal death came upon them on account of original sin, SO DID ALSO ETERNAL; for God threatened both when he said; "In dying you shall die." *Even young serpents and the whelps of wolves*, who cannot as yet harm anybody, are put to death, and with justice. How so? Because they are of such a nature, that they easily can do harm. Therefore EVEN INFANTS ARE DESERVEDLY DAMNED, on account of the *nature they have*, to wit, a wicked nature and repugnant to the law of God.'*

The analogy here presented between infants, and young serpents, &c., is a favorite one with Calvinistic writers, as will be seen by quotations to be produced hereafter. We have already remarked that Calvin's doctrine on the future state of infants, was approved by the Genevan Company of Pastors with whom he was associated. His successor was Theodore Beza, in whose exposition of the doctrine of Predestination we find the following passage.

'Some,' he says, 'are born out of the church, and so remain, to whom God vouchsafes nothing of that call which is necessary to salvation, that is, nothing of a revelation of his gratuitous covenant, and they are THEREFORE NECESSARILY PLACED BEYOND THE HOPE OF SALVATION, since faith comes by hearing, and *without faith it is impossible for any one to please God.* Nevertheless they are inexcusable, so far as relates to the execution of the divine decree, partly because *all are born children of God's wrath*, not of the promise, Ephes. ii. 3., partly because all adults, without Christ [or who are not Christians] are found guilty,' &c. &c.*

If this passage leaves any doubt upon the mind of the reader that Beza here consigns all heathen infants to the torments of hell, it will be effectually resolved by what follows.

'The grace of believing is not truly said to be offered to all men, *unless*

* Op. Theol. D. Hieron. Zanchii. Tom. IV. Lib. I. De Peccat. Orig. cap. iv. thes. v.

* De Prædestinationis Doct. et vero Usu. Tract. absolutissima, ex Th. Bezæ Prælectt. in nonum Epist. ad Rom. Cap. pp. 58, 59, Ed. Gen. 1582.

perchance we dream that the grace of faith is, in some internal and extraordinary way, infused into the many INFANTS that die in all parts of the earth, as well as into the myriads of adults who leave this life before they have heard anything of Christ—*a* DOTAGE,' he adds, '*which needs no refutation.*'*

Heathens and infidels, then, are by Beza, as well as by Dr Emmons, 'turned into hell,' and that too with an express caution, on the part of the former writer, against any merciful exception in regard to their infants.

But we must return to our author, who, in his second letter, says;—

'It might suffice,—in order to repel the charge, to show that his [the reviewer's] proofs are nugatory. But as Calvinism has *so long* been misrepresented on this point, and *the memory of the illustrious dead blackened with calumny*, I choose to take a wider range, and show, that in every age, the most authentic documents stamp falsehood upon the charge so long repeated, that Calvinists believe and teach the damnation of infants;—that it is made and propagated, not only without evidence, but against evidence; and is, probably, an instance unparalleled, of a slander so long sustained in the face of indubitable evidence to the contrary.' p. 78.

Strong language this, and strong in proof should he be, who presumes to utter it. How far Dr Beecher is justified in using it let us now examine.

The first thing our author meets with in his 'wider range,' is the 'Harmony of Confessions,'—'concerning which,' remarks Jeremy Taylor, 'I shall say this, that, in this article [of original sin], the Harmony makes as good music as bells ringing backwards; and they agree, especially when they come to be explicated and untwisted into their minute and explicit meanings, as much as Lutheran and Calvinist, as Papist and Protestant, as Thomas and Scotus, as Remonstrant and Dordrechtan, that is, as much as *pro* and *con*, or but a very little more.'† Dr Beecher introduces his citations from this excellent authority for deciding a point in ecclesiastical history, thus;—

'That the Calvinistic creeds from the Reformation to this day teach no such doctrine as that infants are damned, is a matter of perfect notoriety. I do not believe the reviewer can find a Calvinistic creed, the work of any age, which teaches the doctrine of infant damnation, or any doctrine which either directly or remotely implies it. I have before me, A HARMONY OF THE CONFESSIONS OF THE FAITH OF THE CHRISTIAN AND REFORMED CHURCHES, WHICH PURELY PROFESS THE HOLY DOCTRINE OF THE GOSPEL, IN ALL THE CHIEF KINGDOMS, NATIONS, AND PROVINCES OF EUROPE; and though it does not belong to me to prove a negative, I volunteer to do so, that the Christian public may see the documents for themselves, and know that they teach no such thing as the doctrine of infant damnation.'—pp. 78, 79.

* Beza, De Prædert. p. 18.

† Works, vol. ix. p. 374.

But what if the reviewer should not succeed in finding a creed expressly to his purpose? Would the doctrine that infants are damned be the less a doctrine of Calvinism for that? Nobody ever contended that it is a *leading* doctrine of any creed, and in drawing up creeds and confessions, it is the leading doctrines only that we ought to expect. Infant damnation is a mere consequence of the Calvinistic notions of predestination and original sin, and is by no means so prominent a feature of the system as to be looked for in Calvinistic formularies, though we hope to show, that, against expectation, it is still to be found there. We have no time to follow Dr Beecher in 'his wider range,' through some nine or ten of the Protestant Confessions, and shall therefore confine our attention to the Augsburg Confession, the English Church, the Synod of Dort, and the Westminster Assembly, trusting that if we can show the 'monstrous doctrine' in these, Dr Beecher himself will be satisfied. The first of them is thus introduced to our notice by our learned and very accurate author.

'The Confession of Augsburg, is Lutheran, and, though stronger than any Calvinistic confession, does not teach that infants are damned; for the Lutheran church, though their symbol remains, hold to the doctrine that infants are saved, with more decision probably, than any other.

'The article on original sin is, "All that come into the world are through Adam's fall, subject to God's wrath, and eternal death." (By "subject" is to be understood, liable to, exposed to; otherwise, they would be made to teach the damnation of all men.) "This original blot is sin indeed, condemning and bringing eternal death even now also upon them which are not born again by baptism, and the Holy Ghost." This respects adults as well as infants, and asserts the necessity of regeneration, in consequence of original sin, in respect to both adults and infants; but no more decides that infants dying in infancy, are damned, than it decides that all the adult subjects of original sin are damned.'—p. 79.

Now this very article cited by Dr Beecher, teaches the actual damnation of infants, and that, too, according to the admission of Lutheran writers themselves, and, what is more, according to this very Augsburg Confession and other symbolical books of the Lutheran church. Our author's *absque remedio*, or even his Augustine citations from Ridgley's Body of Divinity, are nothing to his blunders here. The article quoted asserts unequivocally the *necessity of baptism to salvation*, and consequently that all, infants not excepted, who die unbaptized, will be damned. To leave no doubt on this point, we will cite the ninth article of this very Confession, which is as follows;—

'They [the Lutheran churches] teach concerning baptism, that *it is necessary to salvation*—and that the grace of God is offered through baptism; and that infants ought to be baptized, who, being offered to God through baptism, are received into God's grace.

'They CONDEMN the Anabaptists, who disapprove of infant baptism, and AFFIRM THAT THEY ARE SAVED WITHOUT BAPTISM.'

The next of the Lutheran symbolical books is Melancthon's Apology. On the ninth article he remarks;—

'The ninth article is approved, in which we confess that BAPTISM IS NECESSARY TO SALVATION.'—'And as we condemn most other errors of the Anabaptists, so this also, that they contend that the baptism of infants is useless. For it is most certain that the promise of salvation pertains even to infants. But IT DOES NOT PERTAIN TO THOSE WHO ARE WITHUNTO THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, where there is neither the word nor the sacraments, because the kingdom of Christ exists only with the word and sacraments. Therefore it is *necessary to baptize infants, that the promise of salvation may be applied to them.*'

In the Epitome of Articles about which Controversies have arisen among the Lutheran Theologians, there are passages still stronger. Among the 'Anabaptistical Articles which cannot be tolerated in the Church,' we find the following.

'That infants not baptized, are not sinners in the sight of God, but just and innocent; and that in this innocence of theirs, when as yet without the use of reason, THEY OBTAIN SALVATION WITHOUT BAPTISM, (which indeed in their opinion they have no need of.) And *in this manner they reject the whole doctrine of original sin, and all that depends upon it besides.*'

This is again and again repeated in the books referred to, and not content with condemning the Anabaptists, they set down the position, that 'salvation does not depend on baptism,' among the 'false and erroneous doctrines of the Calvinists.' For proof, if proof be needed, that we have not misinterpreted the article quoted by Dr Beecher, it is sufficient to refer our learned author to Walch's History of the Doctrine of Original Sin,* which, for his sake we are sorry to add, is written in Latin. So much for the 'Lutheran church, *though their symbol remains.*' And so much, too, for Dr Beecher's listening to Jeremy Taylor's 'music of bells rung backwards,' or the 'Harmony of Confessions,' instead of examining the Confessions themselves.

Upon the English Confession, the Articles and Liturgy of the English church, we have but little to remark. We have

* Walchii Miscell. Sac. Lib. I. Exercit. VII. § 24. See also, Rechenberg's Appendix Tripartita Historico-Theolog. ad Libros Eccles. Luther. Symbolicos, P. II. cap. x. § 2, where it is said, with a reference to the very article of the Augsburg Confession quoted by Dr Beecher, 'Baptism is necessary to all men for salvation, EVEN TO INFANTS.' From a note to the 'Harmony of Confessions,' referring to a part of the work which is missing from our copy, we learn that the Confession of Saxony, which we have not examined, agrees on this point with that of Augsburg.

no doubt the framers of those articles held the common doctrine of the age, that baptism was essential to salvation, and that such as died without it, and especially heathens and infidels, would be damned. Thus in the form for the public baptism of infants, in the Liturgy, we read;—

'All men are conceived and born in sin, and our Saviour Christ saith, "None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of WATER and of the Holy Ghost."'

The common interpretation of these words of our Saviour, was, that baptism by water was essential to constitute a 'living member of Christ's holy church,' and the common doctrine, that those who were not within its pale, could not be heirs of the promises. In a work before us, by the Rev. Henry John Todd, Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty, we are presented, from authentic documents, with the 'Doctrines of our [the English] Reformers, which are the Groundwork of certain of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.' On the Sacrament of Baptism, we have the following passage from the 'Articles devised by the King's Highness Majesty, to establish christian quietness and amity among us, and to avoid contentious opinions, &c. 1536.'

'Item, the promise of grace and everlasting life, which promise is adjoined unto this Sacrament of Baptism, pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents, and children; and they ought therefore, and must needs be, baptized: And that by the Sacrament of Baptism they do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favor of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God; insomuch as infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, *and* ELSE NOT.'

Mr Todd, it is true, adds in a note, 'The reformers afterwards thought differently, and omitted this expression.' But he offers no other proof of their change of faith than this omission of itself furnishes, which may have been made from other motives. But be that as it may, the doctrine of infant damnation continued to be held by members of the English church, this omission notwithstanding. Thus Matthew Scrivener, the learned author of a work on the use of the Fathers, tells us that,

'Either all children *must be damned dying unbaptized*, or they must have baptism. The consequent is plain from that principle in Christian religion, which Anabaptists have been constrained to deny, to uphold their other, *That all sin not washed away or expiated, exposes to damnation*: and the principle in Christian religion, is, That children come into the world infected with original sin; and therefore if there be no remedy against that provided by God, all children of Christian parents, which St Paul says are holy, are liable to eternal death, without remedy. Now there *is no remedy but Christ; and his death and passion are not communi-*

cated unto any but by outward signs and sacraments. And no other do we read of but this of water in baptism.' *

Archbishop Usher, speaking of 'young serpents and wolves,' writes as follows.

'*Then it appeareth, that by propagation from our last parents we are become partakers of the sin of our first parents?*

'Even so, and for the same transgression of our first parents, by the most righteous judgment of God, we are conceived in sin, and born in iniquity, and unto misery, Ps. 51. 5. for men are not now born as *Adam* was created, but *death doth reign over them also that sinned not after the like manner of the transgression of Adam*, Rom. 5. 14. that is, over INFANTS, who are born in sin, and not by imitation, but by an inherent corruption of sin, even as we see the young serpents and wolves that never stung men or devoured sheep, are notwithstanding worthy to die, because there are principles of hurtfulness and poisonsomness in them.' †

'*But what say you of infants baptized that are born in the church; doth the inward grace in their baptism always attend upon the outward sign?*

'SURELY NO; the sacrament of baptism is effectual in infants, only to those, and to all those, who belong unto the election of grace.] Which thing though we (in the judgment of charity) do judge of every particular infant, YET WE HAVE NO GROUND TO JUDGE SO OF ALL IN GENERAL; or if we should judge so, yet it is not any judgment of certainty; we may be mistaken.' ‡

Our author may perhaps cavil at these quotations, and we will therefore give him another from the same writer, which must satisfy incredulity itself.

'*How doth God suffer them to run into condemnation?*

'In a divers manner: SOME REPROBATES DYING INFANTS, other of riper Years; of which latter sort, some are not called, others called.

'*How doth God deal with Reprobates dying Infants?*

'Being once conceived, they are in a state of Death, (Rom. 5. 14.) by reason of the Sin of Adam imputed, and of Original Corruption cleaving to their Nature, wherein also DYING THEY PERISH: As (for instance) the Children of Heathen Parents. For touching the Children of Christians, we are taught to account them Holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14.' §

Dr Beecher dismisses the English Confession and Articles without comment, thus;—

'THE ENGLISH CONFESSION.—"We say also, that every man is born in sin, and leadeth his life in sin.' The thirtynine articles say, "in every person born into the world it (original sin) deserveth God's wrath and damnation.'"

But many writers of the English church, and certainly their opponents, and even some who subscribe their Calvin-

* Scrivener's Course of Divinity; or an Introduction to the Knowledge of the True Catholic Religion, especially as professed by the Church of England. Fol. p. 196. Lon. 1674.

† Usher's Body of Divinity, p. 126, 4to. Ed. 1702.

‡ Id. p. 367.

§ Id. p. 165.

istic Articles with an Arminian interpretation, have thought, or at least had strong misgivings, that this last of Dr Beecher's quotations would go hard with infants. Thus Stackhouse, in his Body of Divinity ;—

'The Calvinists carry the matter much farther [than the schoolmen] asserting that original sin, (besides an exclusion from Heaven) deserves the punishment of *damnation;* and therefore they conclude that such infants as die unbaptized, and are not of the number of the *elect*, (which have always a particular exemption) are, for the transgression of our first parents, condemned to the eternal torments of hell-fire. It must be confessed that the doctrine of the church of England makes too near approaches to this opinion, when it tells us, that "in every person born into the world, *original sin* deserves God's wrath and damnation;" for though the words might be invented with a particular view to the controversies, which were managed with so much heat, at the beginning of the Reformation, and, perhaps, with a design to bring all sides to a better temper and accommodation; yet *they seem to be too strong and express, to admit of those mollifying constructions*, which some, by way of apology, have thought proper to put upon them.'*

Thus 'the good old church of England,' as Dr Beecher says, 'and her daughter the American Episcopal church,' if she be true to the primative doctrines of her mother, 'come in to share in the blood of the little innocents,' as he strangely calls those, who, as he admits, deserve, and are 'justly exposed to,' the everlasting wrath of the Almighty.

The next testimony in our favor is that of the Calvinists of the Synod of Dort, upon which we cannot complain that Dr Beecher has not done his utmost to commit himself as deeply and as thoroughly, as under any circumstances could be wished.

'The Synod of Dort,' he tell us, 'was a most ample representation of the opinions of the whole Calvinistic world. They were convened to adjust the first public opposition which had ever been made to the doctrines of the Reformation. They discussed with the Remonstrants the distinguishing doctrines of Calvinism. But their views are in exact accordance with the Reformers [the Calvinists]; *and no indication is given of the doctrine of infant damnation, either in their doctrine of predestination, or of original sin.*' p. 81.

So says Dr Beecher, but what say the facts? According to Limborch, who, however, was an Arminian—

'The Contraremonstrants [as the Calvinists of the Synod were called,] teach that original sin deserves the eternal punishment of sense, or the eternal torments of hell fire; so that *many infants* dying in infancy, are to be tormented for eternity in hell fire. This is *the common teaching* of the Contraremonstrant doctors with respect to the children of infidels dying in infancy. As to the children of believing parents they do not

* Stackhouse's Body of Divinity, pp. 292, 293—Fourth Ed. 1760.

openly avow their opinion. Some teach, in express terms, that the distinction of election and reprobation holds even in respect to them, so that some of the children of believers, dying in infancy, will be cast into hell.'*

Again;—

'This decree [of reprobation] is opposed to the love of God towards the human race, if we consider that it even includes many infants, dying in infancy. For so the Contraremonstrant doctors *commonly* teach, that all infants of the gentiles, as not being included in the divine covenant, are to be accounted among the number of reprobates.' †

These quotations, indeed, as we have already noted, are from an Arminian or Remonstrant. But they have never been contradicted by any tolerably informed Calvinist, much less by any one at all 'conversant with approved Calvinistic writers.' In all the remonstrances of the Arminians against the dogmas of Calvin that we have seen, there is an article directed against this same doctrine of infant damnation—a fact for which it is impossible to account except by admitting the truth of Limborch's statements. At this very Synod of Dort, 'a most ample representation of the opinions of the whole Calvinistic world,' two of the ten articles given in by the Remonstants in opposition to the the Calvinistic Decree of Predestination, were as follows;—

'IX. All the children of believers are sanctified in Christ; so that none of them, dying before they come to the use of reason, perish. But by no means are some of the children of believers to be accounted as among the number of reprobates, if they depart this life in their infancy, before committing any actual sin in their own persons; so as that neither the holy bath of baptism, nor the prayers of the church can in any way contribute to their salvation.'

'X. No children of believing parents, baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, living in the state of infancy, are to be counted among those who are reprobated by an absolute decree.' ‡

The opposition here manifested by the Remonstrants to the doctrine of infant damnation, was chiefly upon the ground that the Calvinists included within its denunciations some of the children of believers. Arminius himself § seems to have favored

* Limborch, Theolog. Christ. Lib. III. c. v. §8. For authorities Limborch refers to Paræus, Zanchius, Perkins, Donteklok, and Hildersham, from all of whom, except Zanchius already quoted and Donteklok whose writings we have not met with, we shall hereafter produce the proof that they were believers in infant damnation.

† Id. Lib. IV. c. vi. § 17.

‡ Brandt, Hist. of the Reformation, Book XXXV.—Acta Dordrechtana, p. 114, Fol. Ed. 1620.

§ Our authority for this is in Arminius's Reply to Perkins on Predestination. His words are,—'You argue that a foreseen rejection of grace is not the cause of desertion, because that infants who die out of the covenant of the gospel have not rejected the gospel, and are nevertheless reprobates and deserted of God. But

the reprobation, preterition, or desertion of the infants of infidels, so deep had the notion that salvation was confined to the christian church, been wrought into the theological systems of the day. But Dr Beecher may be assured that we shall not rely wholly upon the charges of the Remonstrants for evidence that the Orthodox party in this famous Synod, and indeed of that age, believed the doctrine in question. We shall produce quotations in point, not only from the most distinguished members of the Synod, but also from the writers held by that party in highest repute for soundness of doctrine. Gomarus, it is well known, was one of the most eminent of their leaders, and at one time carried all things his own way. Yet Gomarus, in his commentary on the fifth chapter of Romans, says that death, both temporal and eternal, is the effect of Adam's fall, and speaks of—

'The dominion of death, not only over the imitators of Adam's disobedience, but also over those, "who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," that is, INFANTS.'*

Among the inferences he draws from this chapter, we find the following.

'Since sin, and death the wages of sin, have come upon all men, it reaches even innocent infants, (innocent, I mean, in respect to actual transgressions, in imitation of Adam)—it follows, that it is falsely taught by some, that original sin is ours, not by propagation, but by imitation, and then that it has been remitted to all in Adam, and that NO ONE IS DAMNED THEREFOR, as some rashly determine against verse 12, 14, [Romans v.] Ephs. ii. 5. Ps. li. 7,'†

Lest these passages should not be sufficiently explicit for our learned author, we will give one more from the 'Judgment of Gomarus concerning the First Article of the Remonstrants, on Election and Reprobation.' He first gives the article, and then subjoins Arminian explanations of its different parts in the form of *theses*, supported by references to standard Arminian authors, and then, in a parallel column, presents us with *antitheses* of his own. The seventh, on the 'Special Reprobation of Men to Damnation,' stands thus.

say I, they *have* rejected the grace of the gospel in their parents, grand parents, great grand parents, or remoter progenitors, by which act they have *deserved* to be deserted of God. For I should like to hear a solid reason, why, when all his posterity sinned against the law in Adam and thus deserved desertion and punishment—why infants also have not sinned against the grace of the gospel in their parents, to whom that grace has been offered and rejected." Arminius, Opera Theolog. pp. 835, 836, Ed. 1635.

* Gomarus, Opera Theolog. p. 405, Ed. 1664.

† Ibid. p. 407.

THESIS.	ANTITHESIS.
'No one is reprobated, no one damned for orginal sin alone. *Therefore there is no reprobation of infants.* Grevinchovius against Ames, 142, 145, 150. Episcop. Thes. p. 28.'	'For *original sin alone there is damnation*, which is the wages of all sin, even of that which is not actual, Rom. v. 12, 14, 21. Therefore the INFANTS of unbelieving parents who are aliens from the covenant of God, not born again, are by nature children of wrath, without Christ, without hope, without God, Ephes. ii. 3, 12., even as in the deluge the INFANTS of the world of the ungodly, and in the conflagration the INFANTS of the wicked Sodomites PERISHED, AND WERE JUSTLY SUBJECTED TO THE WRATH OF GOD WITH THEIR PARENTS, 2 Peter ii. 5, 6.'*

Another distinguished member of this famous Synod was Antony Walæus, professor of theology at Leyden, one of the authors of the Belgic version of the Bible, and as distinguished for his moderation as Gomarus and the President Bogerman for their harshness and intolerance. To the question, What is the object of reprobation, and whether any one is damned for original sin alone, he answers;—

'1. If original sin alone makes any deserving of death, *it may also make them proper subjects of reprobation.*'—'2. Otherwise there would be no distinction between the children of believers and unbelievers, which latter the apostle calls IMPURE, 1 Cor. vii. 14. But *nothing impure enters the kingdom of heaven*, Rev. xxi. 27. And, "Unless a man be born of water, and of the spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." John, iii. 5. But that this grace is granted to all the INFANTS of unbelieving parents, the scripture never said; but of those who are without, God will judge.'†

This, Dr Beecher will say, is leaving the future condition of such infants to the 'divine discretion.' But there are two emergences, of very different characters, in which Calvinists take refuge in the 'divine discretion,' or, as it is oftener called, the 'secret council of God.' First, when their system compels them to believe what in itself seems unreasonable or irreconcilable with all common notions of the divine goodness or justice, and second, when they do not pretend to know what is the will of God, in consequeuce of its being unrevealed. It was in the first predicament, we are persuaded, that Walæus found himself in regard to the infants above spoken of. For, in treating the subject of eternal death, he asks 'Whether among the damned there can be a punishment of loss, without the punishment of sense.' His reply is as follows.

'Some of the schoolmen affirm this of infants who die in original sin only, and without baptism.

* Gomarus, Disputt. Theolog. p. 279.
† Walæus, Operum, Tom. I. p. 373. Ed. 1647.

'But the scripture nowhere says this. WE BELIEVE, indeed, with Augustin, in his Enchiridion and elsewhere, that those WHO SHALL PERISH on account of original sin alone, *will receive the mildest punishment.*'—'But it does not follow that there will be any punishment of loss without the punishment of sense; for in the first place, to be forever excluded from the assembly of the blessed and the presence of God, of itself would bring a sense of grief. Even for original sin alone, we are "children of wrath," Ephes. ii. 3. and therefore worthy to *feel* God's wrath; and of all sin the "wages is death," Rom. vi. 23. But of the whole nation of the Sodomites and Gomorrites, among whom there were MANY INFANTS, it is said in Jude, vs. 7., that they THAT THEY ARE SUFFERING THE VENGEANCE OF ETERNAL FIRE; but *in what manner or degree*, we leave to the judgment of God.' *

Again, in his answer to Corvinus,

'How do these things agree with your other hypotheses? You maintain in your [Arminian] Confession,—and that with Socinus, "that this imputation is, [or constitutes] the guilt of *eternal death*;" and then, "*that no infant is in fact punished with* THIS *death on account of this sin.*" How then shall the apostle argue from the kingdom of death to prove sin in infants, when neither death nor sin reigns in them? Do you see therefore that you speak after your own will, but *not what the apostle affirms?*' †

Another member of the Synod of Dort was Henry Alting, a deputy from the Palatinate, and professor of Divinity at Heidelberg and Groningen. Among the 'calumnies' against the Orthodox doctrine on the punishment of sin, he reckons the following, which we give with his answer.

The Calumny. 'That we indifferently exempt all infants, dying without baptism, from the punishment of original sin, and place them with the happy in heaven.

'The Answer. NO TRULY ORTHODOX THEOLOGIAN has said that or written it; not Zuingle, not Calvin, nor any other of the same stamp. But we distinguish between the infants of believers and unbelievers. Those indeed who are born in the covenant, if they are cut off by death so that they cannot be baptized, we number among those to be saved, and that because of the covenant promise which was made alike to parents and children. But THE OTHERS, since not less than their parents they have no lot in the covenant, and are aliens from the promises of grace,—WE LEAVE TO THE MERITED JUDGMENT OF GOD.' ‡

The writer goes on to combat the notion of the Papists that the punishment of loss is separable from that of sense, and maintains that infants are the subjects of both. He then discusses the question. 'Whether the punishment of original sin is eternal death? *or*, Whether infants on account of original sin only, adults for that and actual sin too, are in the judgment of God obnoxious to eternal death?' At the opening of the discussion he has a

* Walæus, Op. Tom. I. pp. 534, 535.
† Id. Tom. II. p. 153.
‡ Alting, Theolog. Elench. Loc. ix. p. 385, Ed. 1654.

passage, in which he speaks for himself and his party, too important to be omitted. It is this.

The Socinians and others, 'twist this question so as to bear indefinitely, without distinction, upon infants or little ones; not so much because they are not capable of any other sin on account of their age, as that, from an outward show of innocence which is wont to be commended in that age, they may fasten upon the Orthodox doctrine a charge of horrible cruelty, and among the ignorant they draw upon the asserters of it an incredible odium. But WE have learned to think and speak of the punishment of original sin, not from the dictates of human reason, according to civil laws, but from the word of God according to *his* law. Besides, we do not subject to the punishment of original sin, *all infants promiscuously*, but THOSE ONLY, who, born of unbelieving parents, are aliens from the grace of the covenant, and do not partake of righteousness of life in Christ.' *

This passage needs no comment, and we shall pass directly to other evidence that the Synod held the doctrine thus openly avowed by the distinguished members of it just quoted. Dr Beecher tells us that there is 'no indication of the doctrine of infant damnation, either in their doctrine of predestination, or of original sin.' This is begging the whole question. We contend that no Calvinistic creed was ever written without giving such an indication, and though in the digested articles of this Synod, we do not find the doctrine *expressed*, it *is* 'indicated,' and nothing can be plainer than that it was so considered by those members who themselves held the doctrine. Nay, it is made extremely probable, if not indeed indisputable, that those members fairly represented the sentiments of the majority of their party, if not of their whole party, by the two facts we are about to mention. The Ever Memorable John Hales of Eton, as is well known, was a constant attendant on their sessions, and has left us an account of them, not very creditable, to say the least, to the dominant party. From this we give the following extract, which we make the longer for the reason that the introductory part of it may be somewhat soothing to our learned author, because of its presenting so many points of resemblance between this celebrated Synod, the 'most ample representation of the whole Calvinistic world,' and a certain Convention which held its meetings in New Lebanon.

'*Martinius* who goes in æquipace with Gomarus in Learning, and a little before him for his Discretion, easily digested [Gomarus's] affront, and after some few words of course, by the wisdom of the *Præses* matters seemed to be a little pacified, and so *according to the custom, the Synod with Prayer concluded.* Zeal and Devotion had not so well allayed Gomarus his choler, but immediately after Prayers he renewed his Challenge and required Combat with Martinius again; but they parted for that night

* Alting, Theol. p. 392.

without blowes. Martinius, as it seemes, *is somewhat favourable* to some Tenents of the Remonstrants concerning Reprobation, the latitude of Christs merit, the SALVATION OF INFANTS, &c. and *to bring him to some conformity* was there a private meeting of the *Forreign Divines* upon Wednesday morning in my Lord Bishops Lodging, in which thus much was obtained, that though we would not leave his Conclusions, yet he promised moderation and temper *in such manner*, that there should BE NO DISSENTION IN THE SYNOD by *reason of any opinion of his.*'*

To be 'somewhat favorable to the salvation of infants,' then, was in this Synod to break with the 'Foreign Divines' at least, and a fit occasion for a 'private meeting,' to hush the matter up, so that 'the enemy,' in the phraseology of New Lebanon, might not take advantage of an appearance of 'dissention,' or insubordination, in the Orthodox ranks. This is one fact. The other is, that the writers in highest repute at the Synod, were almost without exception, believers in infant damnation. For who were these writers? The following anecdote, given by Brandt, will at once inform us, and give an example of scenes which were of no unfrequent occurrence in that dignified 'representation of the whole Calvinistic world.' The President Bogerman, when he came to the clause in a certain paper of the Remonstrants' in which they said, 'That they would refute in every article the opinions of those whom the Contraremonstrants held to be Orthodox,'—

'Stopt there, and with great warmth asked, as the Remonstrants relate it, "Pray whom do you mean by those teachers that are esteemed Orthodox by the Contraremonstrants?" Episcopius made answer, in the name of his brethren, that this was not a proper time to put such a question; but, however, they would name those teachers, when they came to enter upon the business itself. This did not satisfy the President; he insisted upon the naming them immediately; but the more he pressed for it, the more averse were the others to complying; for they thought they could discover, that he only endeavoured by urging them to name those teachers, to animate and imbitter the foreigners against them, as people that were minded to expose their greatest Doctors, to the end that there might be the less notice taken of their written answer. At last, observing that the Remonstrants would not be persuaded to name those teachers, he burst out into a great passion with the following expressions: "If you will not name them, I will. They are Zwinglius, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Marlorat, Martyr, Zanchy, Piscator, Perkins, and Whitacre;—those venerable men, those brave heroes; those noble lights of the church; those happy souls, whose memory is blessed both by God and man. These are they whom you intend to expose." The Remonstrants say, that the President thundered out

* Hale's Golden Remains, Letters from the Synod of Dort, pp. 87, 88. The same thing is stated in Brandt's History of the Reformation, if our memory serves us.

this speech with so much earnestness, and in such a tone, that his countenance changed, his joints trembled, and his words had no coherence.'*

Now, as we believe, every one of these 'happy souls,' with the exception of Zuinglius, whose heresy in regard to original sin forbade it, held to the doctrine of infant damnation. Calvin, Beza, and Zanchius, we have already quoted. Marlorat, Martyr, Piscator, and Whitacre, if we remember rightly, are referred to by Arminian writers as sound on this point, but we have not examined their writings. Perkins, however, is quite as important an authority as any or all of them. He was a leading writer in the controversy with Arminius, and what may perhaps weigh more than all with the exclusive followers of the Pilgrims, a chief instrument in the conversion of our celebrated John Cotton, who became so enamoured of the Genevan theology as to say, that he could never go to bed without first 'sweetening his mouth with a bit of John Calvin.'† Yet Perkins, 'concerning the execution of the decree of reprobation,' writes as follows.

'REPROBATES ARE EITHER INFANTS, or men of riper age.

'In REPROBATE INFANTS, the *execution* of Gods decree is this: As soon as they are born, for the guilt of original and natural sin, being left in God's secret judgment unto themselves, they dying ARE REJECTED OF GOD FOR EVER.'‡

David Paræus also, was a writer, whose attachment to the Heidelberg Catechism, is of itself enough to prove that he stood well with the Synod, to whom, however, he addressed a letter and memoir giving his sentiments against the Remonstrants, which were treated with great respect. But what will be of greater importance with our learned author, he has been quoted, we believe, as good Calvinistic authority, by the Panoplist. Still, he was a believer in infant damnation, as any one may satisfy himself by consulting his comments upon the destruction of the infants of Sodom and Gomorrah, or the Heidelberg Catechism, which he edited. §

* Brandt. History of the Reformation, Book XXXV. Session xliii.

† We quote from recollection.

‡ Works of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ, in the Universitie of Cambridge, M. W. Perkins, vol. i. p. 107. English Copy, Fol. 1608.

§ See the Heidelberg Catechism, Genev. Ed. 1623, pp. 47, where are mentioned the '*punishments* and death of infants, who, although they do nothing good or evil, and do not sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression, are nevertheless possessed of sin, on account of which death reigns over them.' Salvation according to this catechism is confined to the christian church. In harmony with this, in an oration recited by Joshua Zevelius, at Heidelberg, we meet with the following pathetic exclamation against some who thought differently; '*O immanes Briareos*, O huge Briareuses, who do not hesitate to place the infants of Turks born out of the church, within the grace and bosom of God!' Miscell. Catechet. *&c.*, the last work of David Paræus, *&c. appended to the Catechism*, *p.* 200.

But the most important and the decisive part of our evidence remains to be produced. Dr Beecher, quoting the Acts of the Synod, says, as we have seen, that 'no *indication* of the doctrine of infant damnation is given in their doctrine of predestination.' This is not true. Under the head of predestination the seventeenth article is as follows.

'Since we must judge of God's will by his word, which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not indeed by nature, but by the blessing of a gratuitous covenant, in which they are included with their parents, PIOUS PARENTS *ought not to doubt* of the election and salvation of their children, whom God calls out of this life in infancy.'*

'*Pious parents* ought not to doubt!' Other parents, then, according to the common doctrine of the times and of this Synod, are by implication declared to be without hopes. We say, 'according to the doctrine of this Synod.' For it is well known, that when the Remonstrants proposed to discuss with them the doctrine of reprobation, the Contraremonstrants objected, among other reasons, because it would be more *edifying* to confine their thoughts exclusively to the 'sweeter' doctrine of election. The 'odium' of their opinions about reprobation was so strong, that they did not like to have it increased by a public discussion. They did however so far meet the wishes of their opponents, as to resolve that each deputation to the Synod should prepare an answer to their articles in writing, and that that answer should include the handling of the offensive topic. These answers were accordingly presented and read, generally with the signatures of the deputies affixed. They stand recorded in the very Acts which Dr Beecher quotes. There is not one of them which *denies* the doctrine of infant damnation, and there are several, and those from men of high note among both the more moderate and the more rigorous followers of Calvin, which EXPRESSLY MAINTAIN IT. Thus the deputation from Great Britain, in refutation of the 'heterodox' position, that 'there is no election of infants dying before the use of reason,' said;—

'If this be the meaning of the position, That there is no election of infants, that is, of one infant *in preference to another*, AS IF ALL PROMISCUOUSLY WERE SAVED, certainly the hypothesis HAS NO FOUNDATION; nor if it were granted, would the [main] position follow. For according to the method of God's election whether to be maintained or disproved [*nam ad ratione electionis divinæ sive ponendam seu tollendam*] THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF AGE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH IT [*est quiddam impertinens,*] and has no influence. Grant, therefore, that all infants are saved, and not one passed by still because election and preterition have respect to the mass,

* Acta Dordrechtana, p. 244.

NOT THE AGE, although they are not separated from the number of infants, they are from the common mass of sinners; which is enough to establish the rule of election.' *

In support of this doctrine, the British divines quoted this sentence from Prosper to Augustin.

'Infants who have as yet no wills, no actions of their own, are not separated one from another without the judgment of God; SOME ARE TAKEN AS HEIRS, OTHERS PASS AWAY AS DEBTORS.'

To these horrible dogmas we have the signatures of the deputation—'George of Landaff, John Davenant, Samuel Ward, Thomas Goad, Walter Balcanqual.'

The doctrine of the Helvetic divines is expressed thus;—

'That there is election AND REPROBATION OF INFANTS as well as of adults, WE CANNOT DENY AGAINST GOD, who tenderly loves, and *inculpably* HATES them before they are born.'

This is signed by 'John James Brietinger, Mark Rutimejer, Sebastian Beck, *Wolf*gang Mayer, John Conrad Koch.' †

The Genevan doctors, Deodatus and Tranchinus, professors of theology, said,—

'*Of the infants of believers* ONLY, who die of an age before they can be indoctrinated, we determine that they are saved, &c.' ‡

We trust Dr Beecher has by this time repented of having ever said that this Synod has given no indication of the doctrine of infant damnation. It was the Orthodox doctrine both of the Synod and of the day.—'Thus,' says Brandt, * 'were the judgments of all the Foreign Divines upon the First Article made an end of; upon which the President said, by way of conclusion, "That they ought to thank God for the *entire harmony* of the Foreigners in the business of doctrine; and God grant," added he, "that *the like* uniformity may be found among the *Natives!*" '§

It only remains for us to see what was the teaching of the Westminster Assembly, and to give one or two quotations besides, and we shall have done. Dr Beecher introduces that body to our notice in connexion with the Synod at Cambridge, thus;—

'THE SYNOD at CAMBRIDGE, 1648, which represented, not Massachusetts only, but New England, adopted, unanimously, "the Confession of faith published of late by the reverend Assembly in England," judging it "to be holy and orthodox, and judicious in all matters of faith." The same confession was, in 1608, adopted by the churches in Connecticut represented at Saybrook, as the symbol of their faith; and the same is

* Acta Dordr. Judicia Theologorum Exterorum, p. 10.
Ibid. p. 37. ‡ Ibid. p. 58.
§ Hist. of Reformation, Book XXXIX Session, CV.

now the confession of faith of the Presbyterian church in the United States. But this Confession, which represented the Calvinism of Old England and New, and which expresses, also, the doctrinal points of the church of Scotland and of the Presbyterian church in the United States, teaches neither directly, nor by implication, that infants are damned.' p. 81.

But 'this reverend Assembly,' as we have noticed before, did teach the doctrine of infant damnation, Dr Beecher's unmeasured denial to the contrary notwithstanding. Two of the articles in the chapter of their Confession on Effectual Calling, are as follows;—

'*Elect* infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word.

'*Others not Elected*, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore *cannot be saved*; much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested.'*

This, Dr Beecher tells us, 'proves nothing.' That he, Toplady, or any other unbeliever in the Calvinistic doctrine we are discussing, may have an interpretation to put upon these words which will *make them* 'prove nothing,' we will not dispute. But the question is, what thought the Assembly? Did they think these expressions 'proved nothing,' or were they consistent Calvinists and believers in infant damnation? The answer must be found in the writings of members of the Assembly, and in the theological works of their day. To begin with the Prolocutor—Dr Beecher contends, indeed, that his opinions are no more to be taken as evidence of the belief of the Assembly, than his own opinions are to be taken as representing those of the Massachusetts Convention, of which *he* was Prolocutor. But the 'most accredited organ of the Calvinistic party in this country, as he fain would be considered,' will certainly allow the Assembly's Prolocutor *as much* credit and authority in that body, as Dr Beecher is willing to take to himself with the Orthodox Congregationalists of Massachusetts, and this is all we ask or wish. They would hardly have made a Prolocutor of a man who openly wrote as follows, if they felt as much repugnance to the sentiments conveyed, as is manifested by our learned author. How hard does

* While we are writing we have put into our hands a copy of an edition, not yet published, of the Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms, &c. from the Orthodox press in this city, which retains the articles quoted in the text.

the first passage bear upon his doctrine of a 'just exposure' to damnation, without its actual infliction.

'It were worth the knowing of *this Author*,' says Twiss, 'whether any Infants of Turkes and Saracens departing this life in their infancy, are left in this woful estate. If none are left but all are saved, is it not a pretty guilt of eternal death, for which not any suffers? And you may guess by this whether *this Author's* Pretence of acknowledgement of naturall corruption be not only from the teeth outward.' Again—'If many thousands, *even all the Infants of Turks* and *Saracens dying in original sin, are tormented by him* [the Deity] *in Hell fire*, is he to be accounted the father of cruelties for this?' Again—'Touching punishment in hell, it is either spoken of Infants, or Men of ripe years—if of Infants departing in infancy; if guilty of eternal death, tis no injustice to inflict it; and though he be slow to anger towards some, yet it is not necessary he should be so to others.' Again—'It is true many infants we say perish in original sin only, not living to be guilty of any actual sin of their persons.' Once more—'Every man that is damned, is damned for original, as well as actual sins, and MANY THOUSAND INFANTS ONLY FOR ORIGINAL.'*

The next member of the Assembly we shall quote is Sir Edward Leigh, the learned author of *Critica Sacra*. The following passage is admirably true to Calvinistic principles, and no doubt contains a fair comment on the Assembly's articles above quoted. In a note, it will be seen that Leigh gives us also the authority of Molinæus, as unexceptionable a one as Dr Beecher could wish. According to Leigh—

'Arminians say, That there is neither election nor reprobation of infants, and that no infants can be condemned for original sin.

'Jacob was in a state of election in his mother's womb, Romans 9. 11. All men in the council of God are either elect or reprobate. But Infants are men or part of mankind, therefore they are either elect or reprobate.

'1. Infants are saved, therefore there is some election of infants, for salvation is a fruit of election, and proper to the elect, Romans 11. 7. There is a manifest difference among Infants, between those that are born in and out† of the Church.—Children of unbelievers are unclean, and aliens from Christ and the Covenant of promise, Ephesians 2. 11. 12.

'2. That opinion, that no Infants are condemned for original sin seems to be contrary to that place, Ephesians 2. 3.‡ If this were true, the condi-

* The Riches of God's Love unto the Vessels of Mercy, consistent with his Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the Vessels of Wrath, &c. fol. 1653. pp. 39, 135, 136. Book II. pp. 149, 186.

† 'The Apostle, 1 Cor. v. 12. fobids us to judge of them who are without. Wherefore we leave these infants to the free judgment of God; we dare not promise salvation to any one remaining without the covenant of Christ. Molinæus.'—*Leigh's marginal note.*

‡ 'The Arminians say that no one is damned for original sin: that is, the children of Turks, Saracens, Gentiles, who have died in infancy, enter the kingdom of heaven, and consequently are in a better condition than Abraham, Moses, and the virgin Mary while upon earth. For they may perish, according to your doctrine, but not the children of Turks who have died in infancy. Yet the Apostle declares that all and every one of them are born children of wrath, and what imaginable reason can there be why they may not also DIE CHILDREN OF WRATH. Twiss. Contra. Corvinum, c. 9. § 8.' *Leigh's marginal note.*

tion of a Turk's child dying in his infancy, is far better than the condition of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob living, for they might fall from grace (say they) and be damned, but a Turk's child dying, according to their opinion shall certainly be saved.' *

Anthony Burgess was a member of this famous Assembly, and in his work on Original Sin, he not only maintains the doctrine in question, but gives a history of it, which Dr Beecher, before he 'speaks again for God and the truth,' would do well to consult. Burgess is one of the writers we had in our minds as delighting in the anology between infants, and wolves, serpents, and vipers, but we have not room for all the quotations we intended to give, and must content ourselves with the following exquisite passage, which gives us at once an authority in addition to his own, and an admirable illustration of Edwards's doctrine, that the happiness of heaven receives a zest from contemplating the miseries of hell.

'Fourthly, *The consideration of Gods just and severe proceedings against Pagans and their children, may make thee the more admire the grace of God in saving of thee.* For how many Heathens perish in hell, who it may be never committed such gross and foul sins in their lifetime, as thou hast done? To be sure THEIR INFANTS never committed such actual iniquities, as thou hast done; yet they appear according to Gods ordinary way of proceedings, *to be left in that lost estate of nature.* And therefore that is a good quickening meditation which *Vedelius* useth, (*Hilar. cap.* 3. *page* 119,) to make a godly man thankful for Gods grace, seeing by nature we deserve otherwise. "*Ah quot sunt, erunt in inferno miselli infantuli*, &c.' Ah! how many little infants are, and shall be in hell, who never had the knowledge of good and evil, and might not God have left thee in the same misery?" This (I say) is a pious meditation. [!!] Though that scoffing Remonstrant prefix this expression amongst others in the front of his Book, as if it were no less than blasphemy.' †

Dr Manton, who wrote a hundred and thirtynine sermons on the hundred and nineteenth Psalm, and of whose Orthodoxy one strong proof is, that his sermons had no inconsiderable influence in determining Bolingbroke to infidelity—though not a member of the Assembly, was in favor with most parties of his day, a popular preacher at parliament, and, says Calamy, 'generally had the chair in the meetings of the Dissenting ministers in the city' of London.‡ He too speaks of 'serpents before they be grown,' and shows us that the doctrine of infant damnation was not only taught in works of systematic divinity, but actually preached from the desk.

'Arminians say, That of Infants there is neither Election nor Reprobation, and that no Infant can be condemned for Original Sin; *both which*

* Leigh's Body of Divinity, pp. 416, 417. Fol. Ed. 1662.
† Anthony Burgess on Original Sin, pp. 550, 551. Ed. 1659.
‡ Calamy's Ejected Ministers, Vol. II. p. 43.

assertions are false; for we find that the Predestination of God hath plainly made a difference between Infant and Infant. *Rom.* 9. 11, 12, 13.'—'That none is condemned for Original Sin, is also groundless, and contrary to the Scripture; for we read, *Eph.* 2. 3, that we were by nature children of wrath, even as others. It is mercy, that God will say to any that are in their blood and filthiness, Live. Who can quarrel with his Justice, that he should damn any, though he see nothing but Original Pollution in them? Among men we crush the Serpents' Eggs before the Serpent be grown; and might not God destroy us for our Birth-Sin?'*

These quotations, we contend, fairly represent the spirit and intent of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. Election is personal and unconditional, without respect to age or any other distinctions, and where in any class of mankind there is election, there also is reprobation. This is the connexion of infant damnation 'with the essential vital principles of Calvinism,' of which we have spoken, and there is no dissolving it but by doing fatal violence to the whole system.

On looking back we find that we promised to cite as an authority for our positions, Rivet, one of the most celebrated of Calvinistic writers, who, says Dr Beecher, 'indignantly repelled the charge as I do,'—and Arthur Hildersham, whose praise is in all the churches. At the close of his Commentary on the thirteenth chapter of Hosea, Rivet discusses the question of the justice of the punishments inflicted upon infants. With regard to the destruction of those of Samaria, he remarks;—

'This is at least indisputable; that if taken out of this life before the use of reason, they were exempted from the danger of sinning and imitating their parents; therefore, if they were condemned to *eternal punishments* for their original sin, their DAMNATION ought to be of the lighter kind.'

Again, on the ninth chapter of the same prophet, vs. 11–13.

'It is for their own great advantage that they [infants] are often taken away by a premature death, lest they should multiply their sins by following their parents' example, and incur not only the loss of the body, but of the soul, or procure for themselves a GREATER DAMNATION.'

By a 'greater damnation,' Rivet means the punishment of actual sin superadded to the damnation which infants suffer for original sin alone.

The language of Arthur Hildersham is about as revolting as any which was ever ascribed to Calvinists, by that 'traditionary fiction,' which, Dr Beecher tells us, 'for once retained a verbal accuracy of statement not surpassed by written documents.' In the following extracts, we have the 'whelp of a wolf' again, to say nothing of that of a lion or a bear.

* Manton's Sermons, Vol. III. Serm. xxv. on Heb. xi. 6.

'It is evident that God hath witnessed his wrath against the sin of infants, not only by hating their sin, but *even their persons* also. *Rom.* 9. 11. 13. And not only by inflicting temporal punishments upon them, but even *by casting them into hell.* For of those that perished in Sodom and Gomorrah, it is expressly said, *Jude* 7, that they were not only consumed with fire and brimstone, but that they suffered the vengeance of eternal fire. And the Apostle proving infants to be sinners by this argument, because death reigneth over them. *Rom.* 5. 14, showeth plainly, he meaneth not a temporal death only, but such as he calleth condemnation. ver. 16.'—'There is in them a natural proneness, disposition, and inclination to everything that is evil; as there is in the youngest whelp of a Lyon, or of a Bear, or of a Wolf, unto cruelty, or in the very egg of a cockatrice, before it be hatched.'—'Against these *damnable errors*, [one of which is that all that die in their infancy shall certainly go to heaven,] you have heard it evidently proved. 1. That all infants are sinners, and deserve damnation. 2. That many infants have been vessels of wrath, and FIREBRANDS OF HELL.'*

If the reader is as tired of this whole subject as we are, he will rejoice to hear that we shall ask his indulgence for but one extract more. But this extract we regard as one of the most important in the whole controversy. It is from Wigglesworth's Day of Doom, a work repeatedly published in this country, and, according to Cotton Mather, in England; a work which was taught our fathers with their Catechisms, and which many an aged person with whom we are acquainted can still repeat, though they may not have met with a copy since they were in leading strings; a work which was hawked about the country printed on sheets like common ballads; and, in fine, a work which fairly represents the prevailing theology of New England at the time it was written, and which Mather thought might 'perhaps find our children till the day [of doom] itself arrives.' Wigglesworth was the minister of Malden, and a 'fellow *and* tutor,' as Cotton Mather calls him, in Harvard College. The poem describes the transactions of the last day, and the little reprobates talk so well, and their arguments are 'taken off' so Calvinistically, that we shall give the whole account of their appearance at the bar, their defence, and final condemnation. It is as follows. First, according to a marginal note, '*reprobate infants* plead for themselves.'

'Then to the bar all they drew near
Who di'd in infancy,
And never had or good or bad
Effected personally;
But from the womb unto the tomb
Were straightway carried,
(Or at the last ere they transgress'd)
Who thus began to plead:

* Hildersham's Lectures on the LI. Ps. pp. 280, 281. Ed. 1635.

'"If for our transgression,
Or disobedience,
We here did stand at thy LEFT HAND,
Just were the recompense:
But Adam's guilt our souls hath spilt,
His fault is charg'd on us;
And that alone hath overthrown,
And utterly undone us.

'"Not we, but he, ate of the tree,
Whose fruit was interdicted;
Yet on us all of his sad fall,
The punishment 's inflicted;
How could we sin that had not been,
Or how is his sin our
Without consent, which to prevent,
We never had a power?

'"O great Creator, why was our nature
Depraved and forlorn?
Why so defil'd, and made so vile
Whilst we were yet unborn?
If it be just, and needs we must
Transgressors reckon'd be,
Thy mercy, Lord, to us afford,
Which sinners hath set free.

'"Behold we see Adam set free,
And sav'd from his trespass,
Whose sinful fall hath split us all,
And brought us to this pass.
Canst thou deny us once to try,
Or grace to us to tender,
When he finds grace before thy face,
That was the chief offender?"'

Another marginal note tells us that their 'arguments are *taken off*,' by the Judge, thus;—

"Then answered the Judge most dread,
God doth such doom forbid,
That men should die eternally
For what they never did.
But what you call old Adam's fall,
And only his trespass,
You call amiss to call it his,
Both his and yours it was.

'"He was design'd of all mankind
To be a public head,
A common root, whence all should shoot,
And stood in all their stead.
He stood and fell, did ill or well,
Not for himself alone,
But for you all, who now his fall,
And trespass would disown.

'"If he had stood, then all his brood
Had been established
In God's true love, never to move,
Nor once awry to tread;
Then all his race, my Father's grace,
Should have enjoy'd forever,
And wicked sprights by subtle slights
Could them have harmed never.

'"Would you have griev'd to have receiv'd
Through Adam so much good,
As had been your for evermore,
If he at first had stood?
Would you have said, we ne'er obey'd
Nor did thy laws regard;
It ill befits with benefits,
Us, Lord, so to reward?

'"Since then to share in his welfare,
You could have been content,
You may with reason share in his treason,
And in the punishment.
Hence you were born in state forlorn,
With natures so depraved;
Death was your due, because that you
Had thus yourselves behaved.

'"You think if we had been as he,
Whom God did so betrust,
We to our cost, would ne'er have lost,
All for a paltry lust.
Had you been made in Adam's stead,
You would like things have wrought,
And so into the self same woe,
Yourselves and yours have brought.

'"I may deny you once to try,
Or grace to you to tender,
Though he finds grace before my face,
Who was the chief offender;
Else should my grace cease to be grace,
For it should not be free,
If to release whom I should please,
I have not liberty.

'"If upon one what's due to none
I frankly shall bestow,
And on the rest shall not think best,
Compassion's skirts to throw,
Whom injure I? will you envy,
And grudge at others' weal?
Or me accuse, who do refuse
Yourselves to help and heal?

'"Am I alone of what's my own,
No master or no Lord?
Or if I am, how can you claim
What I to some afford?

Will you demand grace at my hand,
And challenge what is mine?
Will you teach me whom to set free,
And thus my grace confine?

'"You sinners are, and such a share
As sinners may expect,
Such you shall have; for I do save
None but my own elect.
Yet to compare your sin with their
Who liv'd a longer time,
I do confess yours is much less,
Though every sin's a crime.

'"A crime it is, *therefore in bliss*
You may not hope to dwell;
But unto you I shall allow
The easiest room in hell."
The glorious King thus answering,
They cease and plead no longer:
Their consciences must needs confess
His reasons are the stronger.

'Thus all men's pleas the Judge with ease
Doth answer and confute,
Until that all, both great *and small*,
Are silenced and mute.
Vain hopes are cropt, all mouths are stop't,
Sinners have nought to say,
But that 'tis just, and equal most
They should be DAMN'D FOR AY.'

What Wigglesworth thought of the 'easiest room in hell,' may be gathered from the following stanza.

'But who can tell the plagues of Hell,
And torments exquisite?
Who can relate their dismal state,
And terrours infinite?
Who fare the best, and feel the least,
Yet feel that punishment,
Whereby to nought they should be brought
If God did not prevent.'*

We have thus followed our learned author through 'his wider range,' and seen how happily he has succeeded in establishing the 'negative' he so rashly 'volunteered to prove.' The doctrine of infant damnation is certainly no very comfortable appendage to any system, and we do not wonder that Calvinists are anxious to shake it off from theirs. In all ages it has been as gall and wormwood to many, if not to most of their party. Still we have seen that Austin, the father of the system, Fulgentius, his pupil, and an innumerable host of his followers in the early

* Wigglesworth, Day of Doom, stanzas 166—182, and 212, sixth edition, 1715. This work has lately been republished in Boston.

ages, 'venerable men, brave heroes, happy souls,' in the language of the Dordrechtan Prolocutor, could swallow the draught, and recommend it to the lips of others. Calvin, whose 'strongest passages, however tortured, cannot be made to teach any such opinion,' snatches little infants even from their mothers' breasts, and precipitates them, harmless as he cannot but acknowledge them to be, into hell. Those other 'noble lights of the church,' Zanchius, Beza, Perkins, Whitaker, nay, even Van Mastricht and Dr Beecher's 'Reformers;' Luther and Melancthon with the Lutheran church 'though their symbol remains;' the 'good old English Church,' with her bishops, 'George of Landaff,' Usher, and Davenant; the Synod of Dort, that 'ample representation;' Turretin, the pupil that excelled his master; the 'Reverend Assembly at Westminster,' with their Prolocutor and Doctors, 'representing the Calvinism of Old England and New;' Edwards and Bellamy, those able expounders of the only 'true scheme of religion;' Gill, though 'a Baptist;' Hildersham with his 'firebrands of hell;' and Rivet, who 'indignantly repelled the charge as I do,'—these and a host of others we have quoted or referred to, and last not least, the tender hearted provider of the 'easiest room,' where the little ones may 'fare the best and feel the least,' though in hell they must be—all, all have been compelled to acknowledge and to teach the 'monstrous doctrine,' the 'horrible decree' which to say they ever countenanced, is to utter a 'slander and a falsehood.'

Nay, what is more, Dr Beecher himself, the indignant vindicator of the 'holy dead,' who is 'thankful that the time is come, when a charge so injurious, and so long circulating in the dark, is made public,' who appeals to 'the eye of an intelligent community—a community which can understand an argument,' a community, we will add, who will not long suffer arrogance and ignorance to sit in its high places, and with the air of superior wisdom attempt to impose on the weak and uninformed, without rebuke and retribution,—Dr Beecher himself, nothwithstanding the great 'change of views and language' among the professed followers of Calvin, is compelled to make admissions on the subject, which are quite as fatal to the character of his God, as the very doctrine he impudently disowns in the name of all who have held it. To say that infants are damnable in the sight of God, and that it is uncertain whether he will not actually cast some of them into hell,* or with Dr Griffin, to leave their future state a matter of doubt, 'bowing in awful silence'† before the

* This is what Calvin would call 'leaping a beam and sticking at straws.'
† Park Street Lectures.

unknown will of that God, the last glimpse of whose countenance represented it dark with anger and kindling with vengeance, is so evidently and so undeniably as revolting to all natural feeling and as fatal to the divine character for justice or goodness, as to assert he actually inflicts the punishment he declares they deserve, that we shall not waste any time in proving it, though it was a part of our original purpose to do so. If modern Calvinists, the 'Calvinists of Boston and its vicinity,' do not believe in infant damnation, we repeat it, that we rejoice at their partial deliverance from their master's bondage. But if ever the discussion of Calvin's doctrine of reprobation should be renewed, they will find they must go back to the 'monstrous doctrine' from which they have set themselves free, or altogether abandon the Calvinistic faith. Dr Beecher's impatience for an 'opportunity to speak once more for God and the truth,' * is now, we trust, relieved. But if he really intends to use that opportunity as these solemn words indicate he ought, the only course for him is, to confess his errors, to call them no worse, and thus make the best atonement to injured truth that remains in his power.

* This is the language of the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims.' Can it be that the conductors of that work, or any body of men who make any pretensions to character or truth, will prostitute themselves or their influence, to the support, either of the positions of Dr Beecher's original note, or of his Letters in its defence? So far as it involves a question of learning, however, there is an 'exhibition' in their number for February, 1829, which would diminish our surprise if they should. At the expense of an apparent anachronism, we shall notice it. It is contained in the following passage from a review of Professor Stuart's Commentary on the Hebrews;—

'The reviewer in the Christian Examiner,' says the reviewer in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, 'apparently had never read the arguments of Professor Stuart.'—'Had he read the volumes before us, he could have placed no confidence in an argument, which he must have felt to be nothing; and he would not have fallen into *some very palpable errors*, which resulted from his following Lardner RATHER THAN STUART. [!] We will give an example of what we mean. He quotes an epistle of Jerome, and refers to it in his note, as though he had consulted the original. It is, according to him, *ad Evangelium*. If HE HAD LOOKED INTO STUART, *or Jerome himself*, he would have seen the mistake, and quoted it CORRECTLY, *ad Evagrium*. But, relying on Lardner, who had so quoted Jerome, he fell into THIS BLUNDER.' p. 99.

Now what are the facts? The Spirit of the Pilgrims quotes the Paris edition of 1609, Tom. I. p. 1060. The reviewer in the Examiner quotes the edition of the learned Benedictine, Martianay, Paris, 1699. This last edition reads, '*Ad Evangelium*,' with a note in which it is remarked, that the 'printed books have given, not *Evangelium*, but *Evagrium*. But ALL THE MANUSCRIPT COPIES retain *Evangelium*, or *Evangelum*.' Other reasons for Martianay's reading are added, which we pass over. It appears then that Professor Stuart followed the reading of an older and inferior edition, and that his encomiast had not wit or knowledge enough to correct the Professor's mistake. This is the amount of the 'blunder' committed by the reviewer in the Christian Examiner, which we trust he will excuse us for noticing without conferring with him. The Spirit of the Pilgrims and its reviewer we leave to digest the matter as they may.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

43. A Discourse preached at the Dedication of the First Congregational Unitarian Church, Philadelphia, November 5th, 1828. By William Henry Furness, Minister of the Society.

THE occasion on which this sermon was delivered, justified considerable latitude of remark. A church erected by the only society in Philadelphia that is willing to bear the name of Unitarian, was to be dedicated to what its builders deem the promotion of true religion. Mr Furness availed himself of the opportunity to glance at several topics on which misapprehension existed in the public mind. His discourse was particularly adapted to the sentiments and feelings of the place where it was delivered, but it contains many fine passages which may be read with pleasure and benefit by every one. His text was 1 Cor. iii. 16; '*Know ye not that ye are the temple of God?*' 'This outward and visible temple,' says Mr F. 'has been reared for the sake of that inner sanctuary, that temple not made with hands—which is in the human soul, and where only He who is a pure and perfect spirit, and whose service consists in the constant exercise of kind affections and good principles, can be truly worshipped.' How is this object to be advanced? By the truths here to be dispensed and contemplated. What are these truths? This question suggests the topics of discourse; 1. To state the main views of religion to which this place is devoted, and 2. To enumerate the principal reasons (Mr Furness should have said *some* of the principal reasons,) why we have preferred these views to all others. 'We owe it to the large and respectable community of which we are a part—that it may be disabused of all unhappy prejudices; we owe it to ourselves—that we may not be deprived of the great benefits accruing from the sympathy and countenance of our fellow men; we owe it to God—that his truth may triumph, to declare our opinions and the grounds upon which we maintain them.' A noble sentence, which we wish every Unitarian would weigh and remember. Under the first head Mr F. enlarges upon the ideas which he thus presents in one view at its close. 'We solemnly devote this house to the purposes of religion, believing in "the one God, the Father," in Jesus Christ as the appointed messenger of God, "exalted by him to be a prince and saviour"—in the holy spirit, as the power of the Deity displayed in the constitution and energies of the soul, in the moral ability of man, and the eternity of moral distinctions.' This passage is followed by a discussion of the duty of free inquiry and its consistency with true charity, which, though it mars the unity of discourse, we are glad was not omitted, as it affords some of the most valuable paragraphs in the sermon.

The grounds of preference for his own views, advanced by Mr Furness are, 1. Their *universal reception*,—that no Christian has ever denied or doubted them. 'When we consider what a discordant host of opinions covers the christian world, what an immense influence self-interest and passion in a thousand forms have had upon the human mind, inducing it to deny and assert almost everything, is there not a very strong presumption in favor of those views' [we wish the frequent repetition of this word had been avoided,] 'which amidst the incessant and stormy fluctuations of human opinion have always remained, sometimes indeed virtually disputed, never expressly, never perhaps acknowledged in all their importance, yet never directly denied?' 2. That, 'Liberal Christianity is a purely *scriptural* system.' The remarks under this head are confined chiefly to a notice of errors that have prevailed in the interpretation of the Bible. They are just, but we think Mr F. might have given a more direct and satisfactory defence of his position. 3. That 'this system is eminently *practical*.' If our limits permitted, we should be glad to make large quotations, but we can only copy a part of the reply which Mr. F., after bringing positive proof that Unitarianism surpasses other systems in moral power and spiritual efficacy, makes to the question, why is not its superiority proved by its effects? We are disposed to regard it as more ingenious than sound, but let our readers judge.

'Under these circumstances, so far from con

sidering it an objection to Unitarianism that its influence is not very perceptible, we should be seriously concerned if we saw it followed by rapid and striking effects. We should begin to doubt whether it is that pure system of truth which we believe it to be. If it readily affected the minds of the generality of those whose previous self-regulation has been in no wise remarkable, we might suspect that it purchased its success by yielding something to the lower tendencies of our nature. History points us to those religions which were more or less earthly in their character, as having produced the greatest *visible* effects. The greatest apparent triumphs of the Christian faith were wrought at the period when it was most corrupted. And it may well afford a ground of suspicion when a religion falls in easily with men's feelings and exerts an immediate influence. There is some improper sympathy, some collusion, we may be sure. On the other hand, we may infer the perfect spirituality, the uncorrupt divinity of pure Christianity from its want of *apparent* success. Being spiritual, it can affect readily only spiritual beings. *Every one that is of the truth*, said the Saviour, *heareth my voice.*' pp. 26, 27.

What follows we rejoice to believe;

'But although we may not be able to point to any striking results of the principles of our faith among those who profess them, we have one ground of triumph,—and a great and glorious one it is. None could be more so. All the real moral worth exhibited under any and every form of Christianity, all the real moral advancement made even by those who oppose us most violently, we can trace to the operation of those simple truths which *we* maintain as the vital doctrines of Christianity, and which enter into the composition of every system of Christian faith. Yes, all the moral improvement that has gone on in the world, the achievements of civilization, the successes of liberty, the triumphs of mind over brute force, all of these are owing to the moral energy communicated to our nature by those undisputed truths to which we cling as the great truths.' pp. 27, 28.

'Finally, we value our faith because we believe it to be particularly fitted to the present advanced state of the mind.' The observations on the indifference to religion that grows out of a silent scepticism, pervading many cultivated minds, are good, and show the desire of the writer to make his instructions applicable to the wants of society where he is placed. It is well known, and deeply to be lamented, that many persons of fine intellect and great influence in our Southern cities, deny the divine origin, and hence the authority of our religion. This is the result, 'partly of such a rapid developement of mind as is now taking place,' but 'a still more efficient cause is the narrow and unworthy forms in which the subject of religion is commonly presented.' 'And,' we say with our friend, 'if anything is to save this portion of the community from the most wretched indifference and scepticism, it is, we solemnly believe, those simple and noble views to which, in the good providence of God, we have been permitted to attain.'

It will be seen that many subjects are touched upon in this discourse; most of them, we think, with great felicity. Mr Furness's style is accurate and often pithy. We cannot doubt that such preaching will have its effect in Philadelphia, and we have therefore heard with pleasure, unaccompanied by surprise, that the church so recently opened for worship, is fully attended, and that the society is continually increasing.

---

44. The False Accusers of the Brethren Reproved, and the Accused Instructed how to Reply; a Sermon, preached before the Supporters of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, at their Annual Meeting, May 28th, 1828. By Joseph Hutton, LL. D. London. 1828. 8vo. pp. 48.

Dr Hutton has been favorably known in this country by his discourse entitled 'Omniscience the Attribute of the Father only,' published as one of the tracts of the American Unitarian Association. The sermon before us is such as we might expect from his known liberality and candor. The topic was excellently adapted to the occasion, and the sentiments such as ought to be impressed upon every heart, and made the rule of christian thought and language. Especially in these days of bitterness and division, we could hope that if listened to, they would exercise a most salutary influence. But whether listened to or not, it is a satisfaction to know that there are some men who can stand sufficiently apart from the violence and wrath of party passion to judge coolly, and speak candidly, and utter even a feeble plea for the good will which has been banished from the christian intercourse of sects. It is against the censorious and calumniating spirit of party that Dr Hutton mainly protests; and urges those who suffer from it, to bear it as Paul bore it when he unjustly suffered from it. This is the main drift of the discourse; of which the following passage is a fair specimen as regards both sentiment and manner.

'Happily, there is no christian creed in which the well constituted mind will not find the needful food of piety and virtue; and these, once established in the heart, will render all the minor errors and extravagances of theory com-

paratively harmless. The goodness of the man, like the tree which Moses cast into the bitter waters of Marah, or the meal which Elisha mingled with the poisonous pottage, will often sweeten the bitterness and neutralize the venom of the creed, and that, too, with so insensible as well as efficient an operation, as to leave the worthy professor altogether unsuspicious of its containing anything disagreeable or noxious. As the good man frequently imagines that goodness in others which he feels within himself, so would he appear sometimes to invest his creed, by his mode of viewing it, with unreal excellence, his own virtue, like certain optical glasses, supplying the illusive medium through which what to the naked eye of the impartial spectator appears hideous and deformed, is seen in apparent symmetry and beauty.' pp. 11–13.

Our readers may also be pleased to see the following passage near the conclusion.

'My Unitarian brethren, let the advice of this great and good man, enforced as it was by his bright example, sink into our hearts. It is true that we have been, and are to this day, grievously calumniated by many of our fellow members of the christian church. Under the influence of ignorance and prejudice, the pious and the good amongst them have too frequently united with the unprincipled and the malignant to misrepresent us. Regarding us as enemies of God and of his Christ, they have "verily thought within themselves" that they ought to withhold from us, as such, even that measure of kindly feeling, and courteous, not to say fair and honorable treatment, which they refuse not to accord to the members of every other sect. What then? Shall we on this account shrink abashed from the presence of our fellow men? Shall we retire intimidated from the contest with error? Shall we speak no more of what we deem the eternal truths of the gospel? Shall we fear to proclaim our apostolic creed, "To us there is but one God, even the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ?" God forbid that the fear of mortal man should effectually work this snare for us! Rather let us rejoice that we are counted worthy to suffer shame, if need be, for a cause which we regard as that of God and of his Christ. We stand at the judgment seat of the Searcher of hearts; we are amenable to him, my brethren, and to him only, for our conduct as disciples of his Son. Anticipating his sentence, let us deeply feel, and give utterance to the feeling in no spirit of supercilious aversion and contempt, but in that of meekness and love unfeigned, that "with us it is a very small thing to be judged of man's judgment."' pp. 40, 41.

In the course of the sermon is quoted, by way of illustrating the subject, a very remarkable passage from Isaac Taylor; which it will do our readers good *to peruse very deliberately*—especially as the book from which it is taken is recommended by a celebrated Orthodox review *as excellently adapted to be put into the hands of the young*, and written throughout in a tone of *affectionate* remonstrance.

'It is not,' says he, [Taylor] 'simple neglect of the Saviour we now perceive, but direct hostility. The mere worldling neglects the Redeemer completely, yet he talks, if put to it, respectfully of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The Unitarian can scarcely stoop even to such customary politeness towards a personage whom in *his heart* he hates, whose claims he resists, whose honors he prides himself in denying. His aim now is to dethrone the Carpenter's son; by sly insinuation to lower his influence, or by open opposition to disgrace his determined followers. As to disgracing the Saviour himself, it is happily out of their power, for "He that sitteth in the heaven shall laugh at them, Jehovah shall have them in derision." Is it possible,' he continues, 'to suppose that a mind thus acting can be innocent in its motives, its conclusions, its determinations? If our thoughts are known to God, all their operations are known, with every cause of effects so perverse. If he searches the heart, there will he see not only real opposition, but rancorous ill will against the Lord, and against his Anointed.' pp. 17,18.

Upon this passage Dr Hutton observes, in a note, 'I trust that few such passages are to be found in the pages of modern controversy. I add with pleasure, that my memory does not enable me to refer to one, in which the province of the Searcher of hearts is so directly invaded, or the injunction of the Redeemer against hasty and uncharitable judgments, in appearance at least, so completely set at defiance.' We suppose from this, that he has not seen some recent publications on this side of the water.

---

45. 'Faith and Works inseparable:' A Sermon delivered in the First Parish Meeting-house, Haverhill, Lord's Day, November 9, 1828. Also, 'Confidence in God;' a Sermon delivered on the Occasion of the Annual Thanksgiving, November 27th, 1828. By Dudley Phelps, Pastor of the Church. 8vo. pp. 32.

We have read these discourses with great satisfaction. Though wholly distinct in their topics, they are published together, at the request of their hearers, and we think must be perused with edification and pleasure by every serious and unprejudiced Christian. It is to the first of these, that we would particularly invite the attention of our readers. It treats of a subject, in itself of the highest importance, but often perverted and misunderstood. The inseparable connexion of faith and works; the evidences by which a true faith is ascertained; the utter worthlessness of all that faith, which terminates in speculation, or is not accompanied by the purity of true piety and virtue,—are here exhibited with clearness and power. That grand awakening truth, that

'without holiness no man can see the Lord,' and that this holiness is the natural fruit of acceptable faith, is illustrated in all its practical importance, and with the hand of a master. Of the writer we only know that he is the pastor of the church in which the lamented Dr Abbott, of Beverly, spent the earlier years of his ministry. And we can only say, that if these sermons are a specimen of the general spirit and tendency of his preaching, we should welcome any other productions of his pen as valuable aids to the cause of practical Christianity.

---

46. Outlines of the History of Ancient Rome, embracing its Antiquities; on the Plan of the Rev. David Blair. Adapted to the Use of Schools in the United States. With Engravings. Boston. S. G. Goodrich. 1828. 18mo. pp. 312.

47. Outlines of the History of England on the Plan of the Rev. David Blair. Adapted to the Use of Schools in the United States. With Engravings. Boston. S. G. Goodrich. 1828. 18mo. pp. 391.

These works are part of a series of histories for the use of schools, on the general plan of the books for education published in England, as the works of the Rev. David Blair. Though this prolific writer is understood to be altogether a fictitious personage, the superiority of his works gave them an extensive circulation in England, and has led to the republication of some of them here. The books before us, however, are original, and are divided into periods, or epochs, marked by certain prominent events, at the close of each of which, we have sketches of the lives of distinguished characters, and general views of manners and customs. Striking descriptions, and lively details, are occasionally thrown in, to give interest to the study, and impress the important events with which they are associated, on the memory. Questions are added to assist teachers in the examination of their pupils.

The division of history into epochs, or periods, for the purposes of instruction, has been objected to as being artificial and unprofitable. But it seems to us not only the most natural, but the most effectual method of fixing different occurrences permanently in the mind. On the whole, we recommend these works as being in general as happily suited to the purposes of instruction as any within our knowledge.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Mission at Calcutta.—To the Editor of the Christian Examiner.

'Sir,—By a recent arrival from Calcutta, I have learned that Mr Adam has retired from the missionary service there, and has returned to a secular employment. I am looking for a letter from England, on the receipt of which I shall probably be able to give you full information on the subject. I will now only add, that, much as I feel that this event is to be regretted, Mr Adam will not, in consequence of it, in any measure lose the respect and confidence of his friends. Respectfully,

Joseph Tuckerman.'

Dedication in Quincy.—On Wednesday, November 12th, the new Congregational Church in Quincy was solemnly dedicated to the service of God. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. Dr Gray of Roxbury; Selections from Scripture by the Rev. Mr Brooks of Hingham; Dedicatory Prayer by the Rev. Dr Lowell of Boston; Sermon by the Rev. Mr Whitney, pastor of the Society; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. Dr Porter of Roxbury.

Dedication in Athol.—A new Church in Athol was solemnly dedicated to the service of God on Wednesday the 3d of December; Introductory Prayer and Reading of Selections from the Scriptures by the Rev. Mr Bascom of Ashby; Dedicatory Prayer by the Rev. Mr Wellington of Templeton; Sermon by the Rev. Mr Easterbrook, pastor of the society; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. Mr Harding of New Salem.

Dedication in Natick.—On Thursday, November 20th, a new church in

Natick was solemnly dedicated to the service of God. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. Mr Wight of East Sudbury; Reading of the Scriptures by the Rev. Mr White of Dedham; Dedicatory Prayer by the Rev. Mr Sawyer of Dover; Sermon by the Rev. Dr Lowell of Boston; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. Dr Saunders of Medfield.

Ordination in East Bridgewater.—On Wednesday, November 19th, the Rev. Eliphalet P. Crafts was ordained Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in East Bridgewater. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. Mr Brooks of Hingham; Sermon, by the Rev. Mr Barrett of Boston; Prayer of Ordination by the Rev. Dr Porter of Roxbury; Charge by the Rev. Mr Clarke of Norton; Right Hand of Fellowship by the Rev. Mr Goldsbury of North Bridgewater; Address to the Church and Society by the Rev. Mr Huntoon of Canton; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. Mr Kent of Duxbury.

Ordination in Hubbardston.—On Thursday, November 13th, the Rev. Abner D. Jones was ordained Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Hubbardston. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. Mr Clark of Princeton; Selections from Scripture by the Rev. Mr Osgood of Sterling; Sermon by the Rev. Dr Thayer of Lancaster. Ordaining Prayer by the Rev. Mr Thompson of Barre; Charge by the Rev. Mr Harding of New Salem; Right Hand of Fellowship by the Rev. Mr Lincoln of Fitchburg; Address by the Rev. Mr Wellington of Templeton; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. Mr Hill of Worcester.

OBITUARY.

Died, in Boston, November 18th, 1828, Mrs Louisa Greele, wife of Deacon Samuel Greele, aged 36.

The departed speak to the world they have left with an eloquence and a power which flows not from living tongues. In this beginning place of existence, all human excellence is still imperfect; but when this excellence has gone hence forever, we are not disposed to retain in our keeping the thought that it was imperfect. We would bury the frailties of our friends when we consign their bodies to the dust. Their characters visit our remembrance, purified and sacred; and like messengers from a better world, they inspire us with the love, if not persuade us to the practice of virtue.

It is thus we think of the departed friend whose name we have mentioned. But the recollections of her has an unusually prevailing influence, for it is no ordinary character that she has left to our contemplation.

Mrs Greele possessed native traits of mind and manners, and some shining acquirements, which gave her superior attractions in social intercourse. These gifts of nature and circumstance, we pass over, to dwell on those religious and moral characteristics which are the deep and everlasting foundations of happiness.

Our friend was distinguished for uncommon rectitude in her purposes and conduct. And this rectitude was of that highest, holiest kind, which springs from clear, rational thinking, and cheerful views of God, religion, and duty.

She did right, because so to do is conforming to the great law of the universe; is acting in accordance with those immutable principles which the great Father of all has established for the good of his children.

Another very striking trait was benevolence. The second grand law of Christianity was written on her heart, was most fully interpreted in all her relations with the world around her. It was not in regard to dear kindred and particular friendships only, that she laid aside self; her kindly sympathies, her active philanthropy reached through all degrees of acquaintance, all grades of rank, to the remotest circle of human condition. There are those who remember long, patient watchings, and, as it were, all a sister's tender solicitude, over the sick bed of the comparative stranger. There are those,